27-1160

Central BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

S94
J58

The Pedagogy of Jesus in the Twilight of To-day

WALTER ALBION SQUIRES

By WALTER ALBION SQUIRES

THE WEEKDAY CHURCH SCHOOL

A PARISH PROGRAM OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

CHRISTIAN IDEALS FOR YOUNG DISCIPLES

PAUL THE TRAVELLER AND MISSIONARY

ETC., ETC.

THE PEDAGOGY *of* JESUS IN THE TWILIGHT OF TO-DAY

BY
WALTER ALBION SQUIRES
B.D.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
WILLIAM CHALMERS COVERT
D.D.

PHILADELPHIA
WESTMINSTER PRESS
1927

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

COPYRIGHT, 1927,
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

THE BIBLE TEXT USED IN
THIS BOOK IS TAKEN FROM
THE AMERICAN STANDARD
EDITION OF THE REVISED
BIBLE, COPYRIGHT BY
THOMAS NELSON & SONS
AND USED BY PERMISSION.

THE PEDAGOGY OF JESUS IN THE TWILIGHT OF TO-DAY
— B —
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

232.954
S774

In a firm conviction that the best a man can accomplish in any worthy effort is made possible by the loving sympathy and the constant help of those who are of his own household, I dedicate this book to

ELIZABETH THOMSON SQUIRES, MY WIFE,

and to

LESLIE ALBION SQUIRES, MY SON.

15004

INTRODUCTION

By William Chalmers Covert, D.D.

It is highly important at this time that competent students, thoroughly conversant with present-day movements in the realm of education and positively Christian, get the ear of our church leaders in pulpit and pew. There are developments in the field of psychology radically affecting not only the methods of religious pedagogy, but the essential values in religious experience, challenging the reality of spiritual concepts and reducing idealism, emotions, faith, and God Himself to the low levels of mere physio-chemical reactions, due to external stimuli. When such mechanistic and fatalistic conclusions are being pressed upon the attention of students and teachers, and are being accepted as accredited results of scientific research in modern biological psychology, it is time that well-equipped Christian men should make honest effort to meet the fallacies and fatal generalities that seem to abound in this new but interesting field of study. And further, when these materialistic deductions affect unfavorably the faith of the generation in the whole wide range of spiritual realities, it is the duty of a reverent scholarship now in command of sound thinking to clear afresh the foundations of undisturbed truth, and by a calm and fearless survey of the obscuring and inimical influ-

ences, reassure the disturbed minds of religious leaders.

In these controversial fields, religious education must have a leadership that easily holds its own by reason of its academic fitness, its ability for clear observation, wide information, and logical soundness. We make no headway in controverting specious philosophy merely by pious exhortations or by denunciation without argument. Too much is involved in the situation to leave this field, where so many perils to faith and spirituality lurk, to the earnest protests and denials of the uninformed, who are not able to meet the enemy in the open and confront him and his theories with the impressive facts and definitions of modern research.

Mr. Squires has scholarly fitness and a devout mind, and brings to bear upon the vitally important subject in hand the results of years of careful study in the more or less chaotic field of religious education. By wide reading and a thorough familiarity with the rapidly shifting positions of modern psychologists, he has to-day come abreast of the advanced schoolmen in this field, bringing with him his own convictions as a Christian teacher and psychologist. It is from his reassuring positions, arrived at by careful study, that he analyzes and discusses the effective teaching principles of the world's greatest teacher. Without identifying Jesus or His methods as a teacher with any of the modern schools of pedagogy or classifying His daily contact with men under any of the categories of present-day teaching technique, Mr. Squires takes time and

scholarly effort to make plain the fact that, moving before our eyes in the crowded record of the gospels, we have the world's master teacher. His gracious powers baffle psychological analysis and defy all laboratory formulæ; yet lying within his human personality are those elements that make Him what He is, the world's master teacher without even taking into account the overwhelming influences of his divine nature.

Mr. Squires appeals to the gospel narrative for his evidential materials, undergirding the major thesis of the first half of his volume. He holds all through that in Jesus were active the most effective teaching powers the realm of truth has known, that these powers are worthy of painstaking study, capable of interpretation in terms of present-day teaching, and entirely competent to point the way to effectiveness for this advanced teaching generation.

It is in the latter half of Mr. Squire's book that his abilities as an effective polemic and Christian teacher come to the help of the confused and dismayed religious thought world. His task would have been inadequately done had the author closed this discussion of the problems of modern religious education, keeping his mind to the end oblivious to the perils that beset the essential character of truth, as well as the whole philosophy of living. His study of human conduct in the light of purposive choice over against mechanical necessity, together with a review of the motives that enter into these choices, carries the student into the heart of present-day psychological controversy. In this debate one

follows with great satisfaction the reasoning of Mr. Squires', finding ultimately as he does that altruistic ideals are not explained on the ground of mere social relationships, but ground themselves in mystical religious experience, explained by spiritual contact with God as an objective reality.

Here is a tonic corrective for much ill-balanced unchristian thinking in the realm of religious education to-day, and a sure-footed leadership to be trusted by all who yearn for a Christ-centered program of spiritual culture.

FOREWORD

In a recent issue of *Harper's Magazine* there appeared an article by John B. Watson, entitled "How We Think: A Behaviourist's View." [1] Dr. Watson's explanation of the thinking process is indicated by the following quotation from his article: "Thought then is a form of general bodily activity just as simple (or just as complex) as tennis playing. The only difference is we use the muscles of our throat, larynx, and chest instead of the muscles of our arms, legs, and trunk. If we could actually see the play of the muscles of the chest, throat, and larynx when we think, no mystery would ever have grown up."

Dr. Watson accounts for the continued association of mystery with thinking by assuming that medicine men and churchmen have persistently cultivated it for their own advantage. In this connection he says, "Throughout the ages churchmen—all medicine men in fact—have kept the public under control by making them believe that whatever goes on in the world which can't be easily observed must be mysterious, must be strong medicine, something much more powerful than those things which can be observed. The motive is obvious. It is the only way the medicine man can keep control."

[1] *Harper's Magazine*, June, 1926, page 40.

I have not quoted Dr. Watson for the sake of refuting him. His explanation of the thought process and his sweeping and serious charges against the leader of religion may be left, for the present at least, to the consideration and judgment of the reader. His writings have been quoted as an illustration and because of the fact that they are significant of a great deal of the thinking of our day. Dr. Watson may be looked upon as an extremist member of the group to which he belongs, but he has many followers. The editors of the magazine in which the article appeared say that the theories contained in the article have been accepted in colleges and universities throughout the country.

Dr. Watson's article is significant of a condition which is influencing religious education profoundly to-day. We may not be very much interested in Dr. Watson's theories, but as religious educators we ought to be greatly interested in the conditions of thought within our country which make such theories possible of wide publicity and likewise acceptable to at least some intelligent people. We have come to a time of profound change not only in the content of thinking but in the very process of thinking. Philosophers like Einstein, Bergson, and Lloyd Morgan are teaching mankind to think after a new pattern. Old channels of thought are abandoned and the mind of man launches forth into new and untried channels. At such a time the thoughts of some men run wild. They throw logic to the wind. They deny the truth in all things old, because they are old. They are deterred by no fear whatsoever

of being absurd. Dr. Watson's thinking is an illustration of this tendency.

Times of intellectual upheaval are nevertheless times of great opportunity. The fact that such times give opportunity to the wild theorist and the intellectual iconoclast indicates that an equal opportunity is given to the sober and constructive thinker. The gateways are open toward a larger comprehension of truth as well as open toward unlimited error. We need light. We need a great teacher who shall be able to guide us aright in this time of change. We need a great philosopher who shall help us make our newly acquired intellectual freedom a blessing and not a curse.

This book is written in the confidence that such a Teacher and Guide has come. It is written in the belief that the intellectual upheavals of our day have opened the gates for a larger understanding of the message of Jesus than the world has known before. It is written under the conviction that a time of crisis has arrived for Christendom; it must either follow Jesus more closely and out into new and larger fields or abandon him as Teacher and Guide.

The varied trends of thought which the intellectual upheaval of our day have set in motion clash with one another in the field of religious education as in no other field. Every factor and element of the religious educative process is being analyzed. Opposite views are expressed as to the inherent nature of the pupil, as to the teaching methods to be employed, as to the principles underlying education, as to the way the curriculum should be constructed.

Religious education, always a matter of importance because of the intellectual flux of the present and because of its being the meeting ground for widely different trends of thought, has become doubly important in our day. Upon the solution of church school problems momentous issues hang. It is no exaggeration to say that upon the solution of these problems depends the welfare of the Church, the nation, and the future of our civilization.

If the pedagogy of Jesus is a light which will enable church school leaders to solve their problems aright, it is therefore our hope in the intellectual chaos of the times. That it is such a light is the thesis which this book was written to defend.

In the preparation of the present volume I am much indebted to the writings of Doctor H. H. Horne. The first section of the book is largely based on what he has said or suggested in his book entitled, "Jesus the Master Teacher." I have also found to be useful and suggestive a volume by Doctor Howard T. Kuist entitled "The Pedagogy of Paul."

Doctor William Chalmers Covert, Secretary of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church, has read the entire manuscript for this book and graciously consented to write an Introduction for it. Doctor Harold McAfee Robinson, Doctor John T. Faris, and Reverend Park Hays Miller, members of the Educational Staff of the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, have also examined the manuscript and have made valuable suggestions. The help of these friends has been of much importance to the writer, though they are

of course not to be considered responsible for any of the particular statements or general inferences which the book may contain.

Perhaps it ought to be said here that while this book deals primarily with the teaching work of Jesus its author would in no sense intimate that the whole of the redemptive work of the Christ can be summed up under that category. He regards Jesus as the one incomparable teacher of all the ages, but he regards him likewise as Saviour and Lord, and believes that in the intimacy of his relationships to the souls of believers he is something more than can be contained or suggested by even that wonderful name the "Teacher come from God."

W. A. S.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
Jan. 1, 1927.

CONTENTS

PART I: CHURCH SCHOOL TEACHING AND THE FOUNDER OF OUR FAITH

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Darkness or Dawn for the Schools of the Church	21
II	The Incomparable Teacher	37
III	The Great Teacher and the Needs of the Hour	51

PART II: METHODS OF THE MASTER TEACHER

IV	Lessons Taught by Jacob's Well	67
V	Other Methods of the Master Teacher	83
VI	The Great Teacher's Relationships to His Pupils	102
VII	How Jesus Molded the Thought Life of His Pupils	120
VIII	How Jesus Molded the Emotional Life of His Pupils	137
IX	The Place of Expression in the Program of Jesus	153

PART III: PHILOSOPHICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THEIR RELATION TO THE PEDAGOGY OF JESUS

X	The Ultimate Explanation of Human Conduct: Is It Mechanical Necessity or Purposive Choice?	171
XI	The Highest Motives in Purposive Choice: Are They Found in Self-Centered Satisfiers or in Altruistic Ideals?	187

CHAPTER		PAGE
XII	The Ultimate Sources of Altruistic Ideals: Are They Found in Social Relationships or in Mystical Religious Experience?	204
XIII	Mystical Religious Experience: Is It Due to Misinterpretation of Subjective Data or to Spiritual Contact with the Deity as an Objective Reality?	220
XIV	The Nature of Religious Education: Is the Religious Educative Process Limited to Definite Decisions in the Presence of Concrete Situations, or Has the Whole Range of Experience Educational Value?	236
XV	The Nature of Truth: Is Truth Something Fixed and Eternal, or Is It Something Relative and Changeable?	251
XVI	Has the Christian Religion a Gospel Message or Only a Continuing Program of Social Experimentation?	267
XVII	A Christ-Centered Program of Religious Education	281

PART I

CHURCH SCHOOL TEACHING AND THE FOUNDER OF OUR FAITH

"All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."—*Matt.* 28: 18-20.

CHAPTER I

Darkness or Dawn for the Schools of the Church

Ours is a self-complacent age. We speak incessantly of "ancient traditions in the light of modern scholarship," and we smile at "archaic interpretations of the universe in the light of twentieth century science." This attitude toward things of the long ago has become habitual with us. Of late we have been manifesting it toward things that are old, but which have long been given reverence. We have been writing books on "The Old Testament in the Light of To-day," and some of our "modern interpretations of the New Testament" are robbing the scriptures of elements which our forefathers laid down their lives to preserve. I am not advocating obscurantism. It is a good thing to use all the knowledge we have when we are investigating any subject. I am only intimating that this assumed superiority of our own understanding over the understanding of those who have lived in ages gone should have its limitations. Modesty is always an element of true wisdom. At all events, I am convinced that there is one Figure of history toward whom our customary attitude ought never to be manifested; one before whom the wisest people of our day will maintain a reverent and a docile attitude. Feeling as I do

about this matter, I have chosen as the title of this book, not "The Pedagogy of Jesus in the Light of To-day," but "The Pedagogy of Jesus in the Twilight of To-day."

A HEBREW PROPHET AND HIS VISION OF A COMING LIGHT

The term *twilight* is non-committal. There is a twilight of the dawn and there is a twilight of the dusk. In so far as religious education is concerned we are passing through a twilight period, a period like that so graphically described in the writings of a certain Hebrew prophet. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be bright nor dark; the bright ones shall withdraw themselves: but it shall be one day which is known unto Jehovah; not day and not night; but it shall come to pass, that at evening time there shall be light." [1] This striking metaphor of the Hebrew prophet is based on a natural phenomenon characteristic of Palestine. He evidently has in mind a type of day well known to his hearers, a day when the sirocco has come sweeping in hot from the Arabian deserts, throwing dust across the sun, turning the sunlit hills into a gray landscape under a gray sky, and bringing on a twilight dusk at midday. At such times the high-lights of sky and landscape withdraw and it is neither wholly light nor wholly dark. Sometimes the clouds gather behind the gray curtains of the skies and it becomes almost as dark as night.

[1] Zech. 14:6, 7. American Revised Version. Marginal reading in part.

This midday darkness is apt to end abruptly in a downpour of rain. The descending raindrops gradually clear the air of its dust and not infrequently toward evening the sun breaks through the clouds flooding all the rain-refreshened landscape with its golden light. It comes to pass that, after the darkened day, at evening time there is light.

We who believe that Jesus is the Light of the world will agree that the Hebrew prophet's vision was true and his figure well chosen. Upon the mingled light and darkness of the world, Jesus shed an illumination which marked the beginning of a new age. Before he came even the best of men were little more than gropers in the twilight as they felt after God. With his coming it was made possible for men to walk in the light as he is in the light. If men find themselves still dwelling in twilight regions of truth it is because they have not fully believed in the Light and have followed it only haltingly and from afar.

This book is written in the belief that the Great Teacher has the light which we need in our twilight period of religious education; in the confidence that, if we follow him, we shall come out into a new and wonderful day for the teaching work of the Church. The task before us is to discover how the teachings of Jesus and the elements of his personality apply to the multiplied problems with which religious teaching is encumbered at the present time. As a preparation for this large task it will be helpful to consider briefly the present status of religious education in our country.

CONDITIONS WHICH MENACE THE SCHOOLS OF THE CHURCH

To one who is deeply interested in the teaching work of the Church, who believes that the religious nurture of the young must be at the very center of the program which the Church is carrying on, the present situation arouses emotions which are in sharp and striking contrast. Some conditions are such as to quicken his hope and cause his spirit to rejoice. Some conditions are such as to awaken painful apprehensions as to what the future may have in store. We are to glance first at some conditions of the latter type.

An Inadequate Program Which Results in Practical Failure. The church schools of Protestant denominations are, for the most part, carrying on educational programs which are inadequate in practically every element which is necessary for successful teaching. The time provided for these schools of the Church is so limited and so unpedagogically arranged that efficient educational work is well-nigh impossible. The teaching force is usually untrained and inexperienced. The church school is compelled to hold its session in rooms intended primarily for other purposes, or poorly planned for educational work. Supervision is almost wholly lacking in any real sense of the term. Lesson materials fall far below public school standards.

As a consequence of these inadequacies of the Church school program results are meager and unsatisfactory. Punctuality is at a low standing. The

attendance of pupils often falls as low as a yearly average of fifty per cent. On the average, church school pupils attend the church school sessions only about half the time. Not half the children and youth rightfully belonging to Protestantism are enrolled in the schools of the Church at any one time. Of those enrolled less than half are brought into lasting relationships with organized religion. If it is the task of the Protestant church to reach every pupil they can rightfully claim and to bring them all into the fold of the Church, they are less than twenty-five per cent efficient in this great task.

The Handicap of a Much Divided Protestantism. The practical failure of Protestant religious education is due in part to the multiplied divisions existing within the Protestant branch of the Christian Church. We are doing a little better of late and church comity is probably receiving more attention, but there is still too much competition among Protestant bodies which have always been nearly allied and between which any valid cause for separation has long since evaporated. As a result of this competition religious education suffers. Some communities have more Sunday schools than are needed while others have none at all.

Compared with the distribution of our public schools, the distribution of our Protestant church schools is remarkably faulty. The largest and best equipped public school buildings are usually to be found where most of the children of school age are to be found. The largest and best equipped church school buildings are often located where the fewest

children are to be found. This faulty distribution has resulted from our much divided Protestantism and from the failure of Protestant denominations to coöperate in the planting of new church enterprises. It is in a measure responsible for the fact that we have many millions of children who are not enrolled in any church school.

An Unconscious Drift of Modern Life Which Puts the Church School in Jeopardy. The church school suffers from many developmental phases of our modern life which are not consciously intended to injure the educational work of the Church. Even our public schools must sometimes be placed in this category. They are more and more aiming to control the whole life experience of the pupil. Such an ambitious plan demands time and the church school, although it is responsible for an indispensable part of the child's education, is compelled to do the best it can with the fragments of time which can be secured from that portion of the child's waking hours which ought to be given to play or home duties.

Modern industry is disintegrating the home; and the home is the natural ally of the Church in the education of the child. The decay of the home life of the nation throws added burdens upon the Church as an educational agency, and yet the opportunities for carrying on this task successfully on the part of the Church are being curtailed constantly.

Every force that is working for the overthrow of our Sabbath laws is working for the destruction of religious education. Religious teaching is largely

limited to Sunday at the present time and will probably continue to be thus limited for some years to come. The establishment of the "continental Sunday" will mean still greater failure on the part of the Church as an educational agency.

Growing Opposition to Religion in General and to Religious Education in Particular. Soviet Russia makes it a criminal offense to religiously catechize any person under eighteen years of age. There are citizens of the United States who maintain this same attitude toward religion and religious teaching. They are numerous enough to maintain a nation-wide organization for combating religion and religious education. The special object of their attack is the weekday church school. Owing to a wide-spread misinterpretation as to what is involved in the separation of Church and State, they have been able to defeat weekday church school legislation in several states and are now battling in the courts for the destruction of the entire weekday church school movement. If they succeed they will have defeated the most promising religious educational movement that has appeared in a hundred years.

The Menace of Diminishing Interest. Perhaps the greatest hindrance to religious education lies in the fact that many people—ministers, parents, public school teachers, and others—who ought to be intensely interested in this phase of church work are hardly interested at all. Perhaps the greatest danger to religious education lies in the possibility that this indifference may increase rather than diminish.

The World War stirred up an unusual interest in religious education. Will this interest endure, or will it be followed by a reaction and will the opposite swing of the pendulum carry us into a greater disregard for the school of the church than we have ever known before?

The fact that interest in religious education had begun to set in strongly before the years of the World War would seem to be reassuring. On the other hand we must remember that after our Civil War there was a period of intense interest in religious education. Many of the church leaders of that day believed that the Church was entering upon a new era of teaching. They expected the church colleges to become centers of religious education and agencies for training an efficient corps of church school teachers. The new day which they hailed so confidently did not come. The new interest waned and indifference returned as the people of that day became engrossed in new material enterprises and forgot the soul-trying days of the early sixties.

The Menace of Mechanistic Psychology and Materialistic Philosophy. Two antagonistic principles contend for the supreme place in man's interpretation of the universe and for the control of man's philosophy of life. Their contention has been centuries long. The names which have been given to these contending principles have changed as the center of the controversy has shifted from one phase to another of the vast problem with which it has been engaged. At times the controversy has been largely ontological; it has been concerned with the

nature of reality and the substantial character of the universe. At such times one party to the controversy has maintained that there is but one reality in the universe and that this reality is matter. We have called this interpretation Materialism. The other party to the controversy has maintained that there are spiritual realities as well as material realities in the universe. We have called this interpretation Spiritualism.[2]

At other times the controversy has been theological in character. It has centered about the conception of a personal Deity as the First Cause and Creator of the universe. We have called those who argued for the existence of a personal Deity, Theists; and their interpretation, Theism; while we have called their opponents, Atheists; and their interpretation, Atheism.

At the present time this ancient controversy is no longer ontological, nor is it primarily theological, though it has really lost nothing of its significance for either ontology or theology. It is to-day psychological. It has to do with the nature of consciousness and the sources of human conduct. Because this historical controversy is to-day psychological in character it centers in education; and because it still has to do with the existence of a Supreme Being and our relations to him, it is more central in religious education than it is in secular education. This emergence of an old enemy of the Christian religion in a new and popular form is one

[2] The term "Spiritualism" is here used in its philosophical significance. It has no reference to the religious cult to which the term is commonly applied.

of the chief occasions for the writing of this book. We propose to view its claims and its theories in the light of the pedagogy of Jesus.

CONDITIONS WHICH GIVE PROMISE OF A NEW DAY IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

What has been said in preceding paragraphs ought not to make us pessimistic as to the future of religious education. There are many encouraging elements in the church school situation of to-day. The disintegrating forces which have been mentioned are to a great extent checkmated by constructive forces working toward a larger and better church school program than we have ever known. These two groups of forces are in conflict, but there is nothing unique in the fact that this conflict exists. It has always been so. We live in a world where good and evil, right and wrong, are ever struggling for the mastery and this struggle grows particularly intense during a transition period such as that in which we are now living.

An Enlarging Conception as to the Importance of Religious Education. That there is a growing conception as to the importance of religious education is evident to all who have given careful heed to the matter. Such a conception is by no means universal nor is it even general, but it is growing here and there, sometimes in places most unexpected. Even the nation-wide conspiracy of the Free Thinkers to destroy the weekday church school movement is an evidence that these opponents of religion real-

ize the far-reaching consequences which arise when religion is adequately taught to children. The efforts of mechanistic psychology and materialistic philosophy to capture the schools of the church indicate that even in the greatest universities of the land the church schools are seen to be of weighty importance.

Our ablest public school leaders have discovered a grave defect in American education which they realize only religious teaching can fill. Public school people who are idealists, and most of them are, have come to understand that under our system of government the most vital elements of education cannot be secured in tax-supported schools. Through first-hand contact with the childhood and youth of the nation these teachers are learning to appreciate the importance of religious education. Judges of juvenile courts have seen the tide of delinquency among children and youth mounting higher and higher and they have been compelled to conclude that the only basic remedy lies in the religious nurture of the young.

This growing appreciation of religious education is by no means closely confined to church circles. It is growing up in those large sections of our population which lie outside of the bounds of church membership. Sometimes this extra-mural interest in religious education is in sharp contrast to the indifference which exists within the walls of the church. Ministers sometimes look askance at religious education and pass it by, while business men like Babson turn prophet and herald its importance to all who

have ears to hear. An adequate appreciation of the importance of religious education is fundamentally essential for any large progress in the teaching work of the Church. On the whole, its development is encouraging.

A Growing Dissatisfaction with the Customary Educational Program of the Church. The development of an enlarged appreciation as to the importance of religious education is a first step which leads almost inevitably to a second step. Just as soon as an individual or a community catches a vision of the true importance of this great work there follows a discontent with the almost hopelessly inadequate program which our churches have been accustomed to maintain. There is a wide and deepening discontent with the educational program heretofore carried on by Protestant churches. New agencies like the vacation church school and the weekday church school are being organized to supplement the work carried on in the Sunday School. Long established methods of church school teaching are being discredited and new methods proposed. Nearly every denomination is engaged in the task of reorganizing its curriculum materials. There is a demand for a church school program based on an adequate time allowance, pedagogically complete as to subject matter and educational procedure, carried on by trained and experienced teachers under the direction of competent supervision. There is a persistent effort being made to bring the multiplied church school agencies into a unified and correlated system, with common goals and a division of labor.

The Development of Sound Principles of Religious Education. Notwithstanding the confusion and danger which has been injected into the psychological and philosophical study of religious education, considerable real progress is being made. Even Behaviorism may teach us something through its intensive and wholly objective study of human conduct, if we are wise enough to reject the philosophy which it so industriously seeks to propagate. Moreover, there is a safe and valid psychology which is competing relentlessly with the materialistic kind and which is revealing facts as to the conscious life which are of weighty importance in the teaching of religion.

There has been some pretty wild philosophizing and some rather absurd psychologizing in the field of religious education during the past few years, but the remorseless testing of time and experience are on the side of truth and we shall probably come out gainers in the end; that is if we do not utterly lose touch with him who is Founder of our Faith and who has builded his Church upon a rock. Of such an apostasy as I have suggested, there is of course a possibility, and potent forces within our civilization are heading straight toward it. Certain philosophies of life which are gaining ground within the schools of the Church are leading strongly in that direction. If such an apostasy from the Christ and his religion comes we shall enter a long night, but God's eternal purpose will never suffer final defeat. If it comes, a millennium hence, India, long since evangelized, may be sending us missionaries to bring

us back to him who is the Light of the world and the Saviour of our race.

Some Demonstrations Which Point to the Solution of Our Major Religious Educational Problems. Some ten years ago church school leaders in America awoke to the fact that our church school program is a practical failure. It was then that certain surveys revealed the inadequacy of the church school in almost every phase of its task. It was then that we first visualized the massed million of spiritually neglected children and youth in our midst. It was then that vast and pressing problems loomed before every soul which had intelligently taken the teaching work of the Church to heart. If we think of the complete solution of the problems which then appeared, we can hardly conceive of our having begun to accomplish that end. They bulk as vastly as they ever did, in spite of anything we have accomplished quantitatively considered. But there is a more hopeful aspect to the situation. We have demonstrated how some of the greatest of the problems can be solved.

By making use of the summer vacation period and by putting in operation the released time plan whereby pupils of the public schools are dismissed during school hours for religious instruction in the churches, many communities have solved the problem of securing adequate and suitable time for religious teaching. The solution of this time problem is of momentous importance since the adequate time allowance for the church school has for a hundred

years set bounds to practically every improvement in religious teaching.

At least a score of towns and country communities have solved the problem of reaching their whole church school constituency. They have enrolled all of their children who are of school age in week-day church school classes. Instead of reaching forty per cent of their children they are reaching one hundred per cent of them. What these communities have done can be done by every community in the land and the vast army of spiritually neglected children in America thus can be brought under religious instruction.

There are churches which have practically solved the problem of securing a unified educational program for their children and youth. There are church schools in which practically every teacher is trained and experienced. There are church schools which have as efficient supervision as is to be found in the best public schools. There are church schools in which practically every child twelve years of age or older is a professed follower of Christ. These attainments are not due to unusually favorable circumstances. They are often found in churches where outward circumstances are unusually unfavorable. What these churches have done all churches can do if they will.

A New Appreciation of the Significance of Jesus for Religious Education. There are movements in religious education to-day which tend to remove Jesus from the central place which he has heretofore

held in the religion which he founded. These are the movements which are a menace, and all the more so because they nearly always pass for being modern, scientific and progressive. But there is another group of church school leaders who are catching new glimpses of the significance of Jesus for religious education, who would make him and his teachings and his ideals more central than they have ever been in the schools of the church. The matter at issue between these two groups of religious educators is the most momentous controversy in the church school to-day. Perhaps it is the most momentous issue in our civilization since it has to do with our spiritual destiny as a people. It is with this momentous issue that this book attempts to deal.

Shall Jesus be central in the spiritual nurture of American childhood, or shall he be excluded therefrom? This question will in all likelihood be answered within the next ten years. Upon the answer to this question depends the decision as to whether these years and a long period succeeding them shall be an era of darkness or dawn within the schools of the Church.

CHAPTER II

The Incomparable Teacher

Jesus has been called the incomparable teacher of all the ages. That he is such is evident to an informed and candid mind. The presentation of evidence concerning the matchless power of Jesus as a teacher is hardly necessary to convince the readers of this book that he is the greatest teacher the world has ever known. Many truths which we passively accept, however, are not dynamic in our lives. There are many truths which we accept and at the same time fail to comprehend. We fail to grasp their significance and their relationships to other elements of knowledge which we possess. Intellectual assent to a truth is necessary as a first step, but it does not carry us very far. We must understand the relationships which the truth sustains to our whole system of knowledge, its significance for our particular problems.

If Jesus is indeed the perfect teacher of religion, the Master Workman in the most sublime task ever entrusted to man, the fact has tremendous significance. It has significance not only for parents and for teachers in the church school, but for every Christian. It is to the whole body of his followers that Jesus says, "Go and make disciples of all the nations, teaching them to observe all things what-

soever I have commanded you." It has special significance for our own times, since we have entered upon a period of change in religious education. Old standards concerning the materials and methods of religious education are challenged and indeed we must confess them to be inadequate. We must remember the fact that these readjustments of our educational program are something more than superficial changes. They go down to the foundations. The most fundamental conceptions of the Christian religion are affected by them. For these reasons we ought to fix our attention once more upon him who was the founder of our religion and, even though we have long regarded him as the great Teacher, we ought to consider diligently the significance of this fact for the momentous religious educational problems of our day.

I am quite sure that the attempt to evaluate religious educational theories by comparing them with principles manifest in the teaching methods of Jesus will not appeal to the psychologists of our times who pride themselves on what they call "a scientific attitude toward educational problems." I am inclined to think, however, that no attitude toward an educational problem is scientific if it has as one of its elements a persistent refusal to take into consideration the educational methods of the greatest Teacher the world has ever known. I am therefore persuaded that an approach to our pedagogical and psychological problems through a study of the pedagogy of Jesus is a scientific approach. Before attempting to discover the deeper philosophical and

psychological principles inherent in the teaching methods of Jesus it will be profitable to review some of the reasons why he is entitled to be called the greatest Teacher of all time. It will also be helpful to study somewhat in detail some of the recorded incidents of his life wherein his teaching methods most clearly appear. The remainder of this chapter and several more chapters will be given to these studies in order that we may enter upon our investigation of the underlying principles of the methods which Jesus used with these methods clearly understood.

New Testament Evidences Concerning the Greatness of Jesus as a Teacher. The gospel narratives usually speak of the public ministry of Jesus as consisting of a three-fold activity; preaching, teaching, and healing. From what we are told concerning these three phases of his ministry, we may conclude that teaching held a central place in his plans and labors. It seemed to enter largely into all that he did. His preaching was didactic. So far as we know, the Sermon on the Mount was his most formal address, and yet in telling of that event, Matthew says, "And when he had sat down, his disciples came unto him: and he opened his mouth and taught them." His acts of healing were something more than bodily ministrations. They had spiritual significance, lessons for the understanding as well as relief from physical ailments.

So far as we know, Jesus did not tell his disciples to bestow upon him any particular title, but they early came to call him "Teacher." The name was

well-pleasing to him, for he once said to them, "Ye call me Teacher, and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am." The title must have been peculiarly fitting for it spread over the whole land. It was the name by which he was known among the common people. It was the title by which he was known among the Jewish leaders at Jerusalem. Nicodemus said to Jesus, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God." The title was bestowed on Jesus because of his customary activities and because his methods of work were such as to cause him to be classed with the teachers of his day. The fact that Jesus was called "Teacher" indicates that teaching was his chief method of labor. There were religious leaders of the time who do not seem to have been called teachers. John the Baptist is never called by that name in the New Testament accounts concerning him, even though he had disciples and we read that he at least taught them to pray.

The name "Teacher" could hardly have been given to Jesus by his disciples because they had a growing conviction that he was the Christ. The teaching mission of the Messiah was still prominent in the Messianic hope of the Samaritans; they were still looking for the coming of one who should tell them all things; but the Jews had lost sight of the teaching Messiah in their eagerness for a national deliverer. Considerations like these, when viewed in the light of the gospel accounts concerning the customary activities of Jesus, offer convincing testimony that Jesus was called "Teacher" because he was preëminently a teacher.

The power of Jesus as a teacher is seen in scores of New Testament passages. Great multitudes came to hear his messages. They followed him up mountains and into desert places. It was not mere curiosity that brought the multitudes to Jesus. We are told that they "hung on his words, listening." Jesus had in a perfect degree that attractiveness to children which is characteristic of a true teacher. The children came to him when he called. They sang praises to him as the Son of David in the temple. There were little children to whom Jesus could refer as "these little ones that believe in me." Women like Mary of Bethany forgot their household tasks and came to sit at the feet of Jesus listening to the gracious words which fell from his lips. Men like Nicodemus came that they might have a few moments of quiet conversation with a teacher come from God. Rough officers of the law were sent to arrest the Teacher from Nazareth and they became so impressed with what the Teacher was saying that they forgot their mission. When taken to task by those who had sent them they could only say, "Never man so spake."

The fact that Jesus could teach so that the common people heard him gladly is evidence of his greatness as a teacher. But Jesus could also teach in such a way as to hold the interest of the greatest thinkers of his day. Nicodemus was "the teacher of Israel," but Jesus with true teaching instinct could begin his instructions at the point where the knowledge of Nicodemus ended. Nicodemus came with the words "We know" on his lips, but he had

not been long with Jesus before he was in a more docile state of mind and was saying with childlike wonder, "How can these things be?" We do not know just who the Greeks were who came to speak with Jesus a few days before his crucifixion. They must have been scholarly men, for Jesus talked with them concerning some of the most profound principles of life, concerning the life which triumphs over death and decay through sacrifice of itself.

What a teacher is pictured in these simple gospel narratives! One who was a teacher of little children; one whose gracious words held multitudes in silent attention on the shore of the sea and on the mountain side; one who could fit his message and his methods to the needs of the busy housewife, the rough soldiers of the guard, or the keen-minded philosopher and scholar! These New Testament narratives show us clearly why Jesus was universally known as the "Teacher."

We have considered some of the more immediate effects of the teaching of Jesus. Teaching, however, cannot be adequately evaluated by its immediate effects. Immediate effects may seem large and important but when tried by the remorseless testings of time these same effects may prove to be temporary and altogether unimportant. It is of importance that we consider how the larger fruitage of "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach" begins to appear in that portion of the New Testament which lies beyond the close of the gospel narratives. Peter's great sermon, the Pentecostal awakening with its thousands of conversions, the or-

ganization of the Christian Church, the beginnings of world-wide evangelism; these are some of the evidences that the teaching of Jesus was efficient. They are the fruits which bore witness to the fact that the Great Teacher had injected into the lives of his followers a new force which was able to overcome the world.

Corroborating Evidences Offered by the Passing Centuries. The New Testament evidences concerning the greatness of Jesus as a teacher are linked to a chain of evidences which stretch across the centuries to our own day. For nearly twenty centuries evidences concerning his greatness as a teacher have been accumulating. They have not only been accumulating but they have been growing more and more vast in their scope and more convincing in their nature. Scriptural testimony concerning the power of Jesus as a teacher have been corroborated by ever increasing and ever widening demonstrations of that same power as century has followed century. Let him who would cast discredit upon the New Testament testimony concerning Jesus as a teacher, first explain how it is that Jesus is in an ever increasing sense the Teacher of all mankind!

Measured quantitatively, the influence of Jesus is greater than that of any other person who has ever lived on earth. More than one-third of the people in the world are his professed followers. Careful investigations show that the number of Christians is steadily growing while the adherents to all other forms of religion are becoming fewer every year. The numerical increase of Christianity

is only one phase of its spread across the world. The influence of the Great Teacher has been steadily spreading through every department of life. His influence is increasingly felt in matters of government. Modern democracy and most of the freedom which we enjoy may be traced to him as a source. Art in all its forms has been influenced by Jesus more than by any other person who has ever lived in the world. The greatest paintings of the world are attempts to portray events in his life, or to make plain some truth which he expressed. Some of the most beautiful buildings of the world are structures reared in his honor. He has inspired the poets who wrote our greatest hymns. Philanthropy and brotherhood are but feebly manifest in lands where the influence of Jesus is not much felt. To inspire the human heart and mind in such a way as to lead multitudes into lofty striving and enduring accomplishment was the task which Jesus the Teacher undertook and he has succeeded and is succeeding in a way so vast that our minds can hardly compass the result.

What has been said indicates that Jesus is the Great Teacher whether we consider the results of his teaching quantitatively or qualitatively. The best that humanity can show to-day of love and unselfishness and noble striving are from him. The preceding statement is offered not as oratorical exaggeration but as the expression of sober fact. For nearly two thousand years the people who have loved most deeply, who have lived most unselfishly, who have striven most nobly for right and truth,

have borne unvarying witness to their dependence upon Jesus. They have uniformly disclaimed any credit for themselves and have said that all they were and all they hoped to be they owed to Jesus as their Teacher and Lord.

I do not mean to imply that Jesus simply let loose certain ideas in the world and that these ideas have been the means through which the world has thus far been Christianized. Teaching is never the mere letting loose of ideas. Jesus taught not only by his words but by everything he did, by his manner of life and by his self-sacrificing death. Nor have we explained all when we have added to his spoken message the message of his life and his death. Jesus is the great Teacher to-day and there is in his mystical relationships with the souls of those who believe on him a reality which is the very life of the religion which he instituted.

Sources of the Matchless Teaching Power of Jesus. The power of Jesus as a teacher must be attributed first of all to his personality. Those who had been his most intimate associates believed that in him the eternal Deity was manifested, that he was one with God the Father. This has been the orthodox doctrine of the Christian Church throughout its history. Those who reject the Deity of Jesus have not lessened the difficulty of accounting for his influence over the life of the world. They have rather increased it. If Jesus is the Son of God he is omnipresent and he touches the souls of mankind to-day. If he was only a man, he is not really present to-day and we must account for his influence

solely upon the grounds of his teachings given many centuries ago. In any case we must trace his power back primarily to his personality. In any case our religious educational work will go forward victoriously in proportion to our ability to secure teachers who are like in character to the Teacher of Nazareth.

The power of Jesus must be attributed in the second place to his message. The truth of this statement is indicated by the words of Jesus himself. He spoke of himself as the light of the world, but he also spoke of his words as being spirit and life. He said that heaven and earth should pass away, but that his words should never pass away. He seemed to put his message second in importance only to his personality in the task of human redemption.

The testimony of Jesus concerning the importance of his message is supported by the history of the Christian Church as a whole and by the individual experience of countless followers of Jesus both in the past centuries and at the present time. Men have taught the message of Jesus only imperfectly, but even so it has been the most potent influence for righteousness and progress the world has ever known. Our barbarian forefathers heard that message in the wilds of northern Europe and it made of them civilized communities. It is transforming the life and thinking of India to-day and its influence extends in that land far beyond the circles of those who have professed themselves Christians. A Japanese lad found a fragment of that message in a mutilated New Testament floating in the estuary of a river. He learned to read it and

it made of him the herald of a new day in his native land.

The power of Jesus as a teacher must be attributed in the third place to his methods of teaching. Christians have long believed in the faultless personality of Jesus. They have likewise insisted upon the faultless character of his teachings. If he was perfect in his personality and if he taught a perfect system of truth, it is only logical to assume that he was perfect in the methods of teaching which he employed. If we hold the orthodox view concerning the person of Jesus we can hardly conceive of him using any methods but the best; we can hardly conceive of him making a mistake in his choice of methods.

We are not confined, however, to such speculative methods of determining the character of Jesus' teaching. We have many narratives concerning the teaching work of Jesus and we can study at first hand, as it were, the methods which he used. In some of the following chapters of this book we must take up the study of the teaching methods of Jesus in a more extensive way than is possible at this point. If we find that in our best judgment he was as faultless in his teaching methods as he was in everything else he did, we shall not have made a discovery. In so far as the teaching methods of Jesus have been studied by honest and competent critics their conclusion has been just what has been stated. They have found in his pedagogy no fault at all.

If the pedagogy of Jesus is indeed faultless the

fact is one of immeasurable significance. To have in our possession fairly abundant records concerning the teaching methods of a perfect teacher is to possess that which is of priceless value and it is astonishing to think how little use we have made of our treasure. If Jesus was as perfect in his teaching methods as he was in his life and conduct, his pedagogy is now and always will be our best light in educational matters.

Any teaching that is worthy of the name rests upon certain foundation principles. A teacher may never have studied philosophy or psychology, nevertheless even such a teacher has some sort of a philosophy of life, some sort of a conception concerning the nature and capacities of the pupil. Such a teacher is often efficient because his methods are in harmony with certain fundamental principles which he has never formulated, but of which he is in a sense aware and which determine to a great extent his choice of methods and his selection of ends.

If certain fundamental principles underlie the teaching methods of even moderately successful teachers, we may be sure that there are fundamental principles underlying the faultless methods of Jesus. We may be sure that teaching which has spread across the world with increasing power during nearly twenty centuries has foundations which are enduring. A discovery of the psychological principles underlying the teaching methods of Jesus and a consideration of modern educational theories in

the light of these principles will be attempted in some of the later chapters of this book.

I am convinced that if these principles can be found they will be a better guide than anything we can discover in biology, sociology, or anthropology. Their discovery ought to go far toward safeguarding the schools of the Church in this time of changing conceptions and confused objectives. The discovery of these fundamental principles is of more weighty importance than a wide familiarity with the teaching methods of Jesus. Methods are particular and individual, they change with changing conditions, but principles are universal and abiding. The records concerning specific methods of teaching used by Jesus are not extensive enough to furnish concrete illustrations of every method which may be needed to-day, but we have reason to believe that these records are extensive enough to enable us to discover the principles which are fundamental and necessary for the solution of our most important problems in the school of the Church. Moreover, we are not confined to a study of the methods of Jesus in our search after the fundamental principles which underlay his pedagogy. Jesus had something to say on many of the matters just now under consideration in religious educational circles. A study of the subject matter of his teaching will supplement what we find in our study of his methods.

In our effort to discover the secret of Jesus' greatness as a teacher we have found plausible explanations in his matchless personality, in the universality

and enduring truth of his message, in his faultless methods and in the principles on which these methods rested. Jesus must be kept central in the religious educational program of to-day because he is the source of supply for our greatest needs. The elements which made him the Great Teacher he is able to impart continually to those who are his disciples to-day. The disciple may become more and more like his teacher in character. The disciple is commissioned to hand on the message of his Teacher. The disciple may become efficient in the use of the methods his Teacher used. The disciple may receive from his Teacher a knowledge of the principles which underlay the matchless methods of his Lord, and through a knowledge of these principles he too may become a teacher who "needeth not to be ashamed."

CHAPTER III

The Great Teacher and the Needs of the Hour

It was intimated in a preceding chapter that in the religious educational thought of to-day there is a current setting strongly towards Jesus and another setting quite as strongly in an opposite direction. One group of church school leaders are coming to look upon Jesus as having immeasurable significance for religious education. Another group are talking and acting as though he has no significance at all. The matter at issue between these two groups is not only of momentous importance, but the cleavage between them runs down to the very foundations of all that constitutes educational methods and educational principles. The two groups differ fundamentally in psychological theories, philosophical conceptions, and educational procedures; but they differ thus chiefly because they maintain different attitudes toward him who is the Founder and Head of the Christian religion. There is nothing strange in the facts we have mentioned. Jesus came to unite all mankind in a kingdom of brotherhood and service, but he realized that in the process of attaining this goal sharp divisions would arise because of the different attitudes people would manifest toward him. He came "to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her

mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law."

A BEWILDERED WORLD WHICH IS TURNING TO JESUS FOR LIGHT

The cleavage which is traceable between the two groups of religious educators extends to a large extent throughout the whole of human society. Strange as it may seem the currents setting towards Jesus in some of the more secular matters of life appear to be stronger than are the currents setting toward him in religious education. Let us see whether this is not the case.

Since the World War there appears to be a growing group of people in every land and in every creed who are turning to Jesus for light. The emperor of Japan speaks across the seas to the Christians of America and he says to them, "Your gentle Jesus is the one hope of universal peace." Six hundred Japanese students were asked to name the world's greatest religious leader, and four hundred named, not Buddha, but Jesus. The people of India are learning to distinguish between Jesus and the religion which is commonly practiced in his name. They do not care for some of the forms of western civilization which have been associated with Christianity, but they are learning to love "the Christ of the Indian road." When they wish to honor Mahatma Ghandi they call him "the Christ of India." Among leading thinkers of the Hebrew race there has been a marked change of attitude toward Jesus within the past few years. Even

Moslems are buying New Testaments and through a first-hand study of the gospel narratives they are learning to know Jesus as he is. Perhaps we have been wrong in trying to bring to Moslems and Hebrews our definitions of the Christ rather than leading them to behold him as he is, and after that to formulate their own definitions concerning him.

Along the lines where labor and capital meet and sometimes clash, thoughtful leaders on both sides are coming to see that the solution of their problem lies in the ideals of justice, brotherhood, and service which Jesus taught and in harmony with which he lived. Statesmen and lawmakers who have broken away from the aims and attitudes of selfish politicians and who are really seeking the betterment of human conditions find in the ideals of Jesus their best light. There is an increasing conviction among those who are responsible for the destinies of nations that there is no sure foundation for world peace and for national greatness except the foundations laid down by him who is the Prince of Peace and the Light of men. We have not had a president of the United States during the past quarter of a century who has not said as much, and whose actions have not been in substantial agreement with his words.

Within the past decade or two educators have begun to comprehend the significance of Jesus for general education. For generations books on various phases of education were written with hardly any reference to Jesus. All this has been changed and no book on education would now be regarded as complete if it failed to take note of him who taught as no other ever did.

We may therefore conclude that our ablest statesmen, economists, and educators are finding in Jesus and his teachings the best solution of their problems. Jesus is coming into his own in many of the affairs of life. If this is true of persons engaged in these particular lines of endeavor why should it not be even more largely true of people who are especially engaged in the teaching of religion? Jesus did not teach statesmanship, or economics, or pedagogy, as such. Help in these matters is found in his teachings and in his life because he touched them incidentally and indirectly. But he was preëminently a teacher of religion, and teachers of religion, it would seem, ought to seek in him first of all the secrets of successful religious teaching. For the most part they do not seem to be doing so. The group of professional religious educators who are inclined to ignore the Christ in their methods and theories, is larger, and withal more influential, than the group that sees in him the All-in-All of religious education. This statement refers not to the rank and file of church school workers, but to the professional religious educational leadership in our higher institutions of learning.

A SPIRIT OF ANTICHRIST WHICH WOULD EXCLUDE JESUS FROM HIS CENTRAL PLACE IN THE LIFE OF TO-DAY

The writer would not have the preceding statements to convey a wrong impression. There are encouraging features in the world situation of the

present time and honest souls are turning as never before to Jesus for light, but Jesus is not altogether central in the life of to-day, and there are forces at work which would eliminate him from even the measure of influence which he has now attained.

There are statesmen who have the spirit of the Antichrist as well as statesmen who find light and guidance in the Great Teacher. Nietzsche is dead, but he has left many disciples and they are not all of them in Germany. Combinations of corrupt politicians rule most of our great and materially stupendous cities and they menace the very life of our republic. The business world tends to sink back continually into the ethics of the jungle. The forces of darkness combat the forces of light in our civilization and all that we know of light is linked with the Christ. Without him the darkness will prevail.

This spirit of the Antichrist is not confined to unscrupulous politicians and predatory business interests. It is found likewise in that type of religious educational leadership which rarely denies the Christ by word of mouth, but which largely ignores him and which works to displace him through its theories and philosophies from his central place in the Christian religion and to depose him from the place of influence which he has attained in the life of to-day. This menace to the centrality of Jesus in the Christian faith and to his influence over the civilization of our times, is doubly dangerous because it works in secret to a great extent, and because it often appears under the camouflage of a broad humanitarianism. In the political world the

spirit of Antichrist is out-and-out. In religious education it comes in the form of an angel of light holding up fruits which have been borne of the Christian religion and seeking to use these products of the Christian faith to bring about the destruction of the Christian faith.

JESUS AND CONSTRUCTIVE FORCES IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

In a preceding chapter certain constructive forces were named as working for the production of a larger and better program of religious education. Among these forces was mentioned a growing appreciation of the significance of Jesus for religious education. In the light of our further study we are probably now ready to agree that this larger understanding of the message and character of Jesus is not just one of several forces making for the improvement of religious teaching; it is rather a fundamental and far-reaching influence which enters into practically every condition which gives promise of church school improvement. Let us see what justification there may be for such an opinion.

Practically All Constructive Forces in Religious Education May Be Traced to Jesus as Their Main Source. The growing demand for a larger and better religious educational program and the increasing dissatisfaction with a meager and inefficient church school enterprise manifest themselves in a multitude of ways. This demand for a better church school program and this dissatisfaction with the customary

provision for religious teaching are seen in the many efforts to improve the Sunday school, in the rapid development of weekday church schools and vacation church schools, in an increased provision for training church school teachers, in the organization of schools of religious education. All of these attempted improvements, however, have grown out of an enlarged conception concerning the importance of church school teaching. This enlarged conception concerning the importance of religious education has grown out of a clearer understanding of the teachings of Jesus and out of a closer contact with his spirit and a better interpretation of his methods. It was Jesus who first taught mankind to place the child in the midst. It was he who said that little children were so precious that their guardian angels stand always in the presence of God. It was Jesus who warned his adult-minded disciples that they should not overlook even one little child in their plans for building a kingdom of God on earth. Practically all that is most vital in the present revival of religious education can therefore be traced back to the Great Teacher.

What has been said is not mere declamation. It is a statement of facts which can be substantiated from history. What has been said is only a part of the truth, only a phase of the far-reaching influence of Jesus. Bossuet was not exaggerating when he said that practically every forward movement of mankind during the past nineteen hundred years can be traced to Jesus as its main source. The Reformation was significant because it restored the scrip-

tures to the common people, but the restoration of the scriptures was significant because the scriptures tell people of the Christ. The Protestant Reformation was therefore a restoration of Jesus to his rightful place in the hearts and minds of his followers. That restoration is chiefly responsible for the measure of civil liberty which we enjoy to-day, for our well-nigh universal educational system, for the quickening of the human intellect which has brought on an era of science and invention.

Out of the Reformation came what has been called the Reformed Theology, a system of religious doctrines which was centered in the God revealed in Christ. Because the Reformed Theology was more Christ-centered and less man-centered than some other systems of faith resulting from the Protestant Reformation, it has borne the noblest fruit of all. It produced the Huguenots of France, the Dutch Republicans, who defied the imperial power of Spain, the Scotch Covenanters, and the English Puritans. In view of these facts of history it is no impertinence to say that all that is most hopeful in the religious educational situation of to-day is due to the fact that certain people are gaining an enlarged conception concerning the significance of Jesus for the teaching work of the Church. Neither is it unjust to assume that those who are intentionally or unintentionally working for the elimination of the Christ from the schools of the Church are working for the defeat of all that religious education has in view.

The Ultimate Triumph of These Forces is Pos-

sible Through Christ Alone. As Jesus is the source of the constructive forces in religious education so is he the ultimate hope of their triumph. We have made a little progress here and there in religious education. We have shown how some of our major problems may be solved. But when we think of the whole solution of all our problems the task looms enormously. When we visualize our immensely wealthy country and think of the millions it spends on luxuries, and then think of the multitudes of church schools that are poverty-stricken in the midst of all this material abundance, we begin to realize that before our country shall set up an adequate system of religious education we must be profoundly changed in heart and mind. Whence shall come the high ideals, the unselfish effort, the passionate devotion, the unfailing wisdom, the sense of values, which we see to be essential for the solution of our religious educational problems? I would not presume to answer this momentous question for others, but as for me, I see no hope of attaining these essentials in the measure necessary for success apart from Jesus and the religion which he alone can give.

JESUS AND DESTRUCTIVE FORCES IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

As constructive forces in religious education can be traced to Jesus as their source, so destructive forces in religious education may be traced to some ignoring of Jesus or to some antagonism to him and his teachings. As the triumph of the constructive

forces in religious education depends upon the exaltation of Jesus as Lord and Christ, so the defeat of the destructive forces in religious education depends on the faith and loyalty with which religious teachers hold to him as Teacher and Guide. We must abide in him, for apart from him we can do nothing.

The Destructive Power of Spiritual Indifference. Our age is not anti-religious; it is religiously indifferent. Any one who has tried to secure a larger and better program of religious education in an individual church or in a community is apt to be aware of this indifference. Most American communities are too busy with other matters to pay much attention to the most important matter of all, namely, the religious and moral culture of the rising generation. Shocking and pathetic instances of juvenile delinquency produce only a momentary attention. This apathetic condition of American life toward religion and religious education is doubtless one of the greatest hindrances to church school improvement. In some ways this indifference to religion is more of a menace to the educational work of the Church than open opposition to religion would be. Opposition to religion at least gives an opportunity for the claims of religion to be heard, whereas indifference is deaf to all religious appeals. Historically there does not seem to be any cure for religious indifference apart from a religious revival growing out of some renewed appreciation of Jesus and his message. If an efficient program of religious education were once established for all the children and youth of America it is likely that the old-fashioned peri-

odic revival would no longer be needed, but it is difficult to inaugurate such a program when religious interest is at a low stage in the public life. We need a genuine revival of religion to put the new program of religious education on its feet.

The Menace of Inherent Difficulties. The task of securing an efficient religious nurture for all the children and youth of America is a great and difficult task. It is a difficult task in our great cities where the population is congested and often foreign-born. It is a difficult task in the scattered population of our western states. It is made doubly difficult by the differences which divide our people into religious bodies widely at variance in organization and creed, and by the multiplied but persistent divisions of Protestantism. The separation of church and state in America has created problems which have not yet been solved. It makes necessary a church school system coextensive with the public school system and as efficient as the public school system in reaching the childhood and youth of the land with adequate and successful teaching. The churches of America have hardly begun to attack the big problems involved in setting up such a church school system. It will take faith to undertake the solution of these problems, the kind of faith Jesus inspired in a little group of people before he sent them forth to grapple with the tremendous problems of a decadent civilization.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE GREAT TEACHER FOR THE METHODS AND THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Thus far in this book we have dealt chiefly in a broad and general way with the significance of Jesus for religious education. We have seen that he is necessary to the inception and carrying on of a nation-wide system of church schools. We have tried to understand how essential he is to the inauguration of constructive forces in religious education and to the triumph of these forces in the creation of an adequate and efficient church school system. We have seen that the forces which menace the church school usually arise from some neglect of Jesus or some open or implied denial of his message.

For the remainder of this book we must deal with more specific applications of the teachings of Jesus and the message of his life and personality to certain definite problems of the church school. These problems fall logically into two classes, which may be briefly mentioned here and then left to more detailed examination in the chapters which lie ahead.

Jesus and the Teaching Process. The teacher is the most important factor in the teaching process. Courses of study, housing and equipment, supervision, organization of pupils; these are all important elements in a successful school, but they all fail if the teacher fails. It is the conviction of the writer that Jesus has tremendous and undiscovered significance for the church school teacher and he will try

to suggest something of this significance in the following pages. What methods of teaching did the Great Teacher use? What did he aim to produce in the life and personality of the pupil? What problems of teaching and school management does the church school teacher have to meet, and what light does the conduct of Jesus throw on these problems? What relationships existed between Jesus and his pupils? These are some of the questions which will be considered as we take up a more detailed study of the pedagogy of Jesus in the following chapters.

Jesus and the Principles of Teaching. Successful teaching rests on sound psychological and valid philosophical principles. Since Jesus was a faultless teacher his teaching methods must have been in harmony with sound principles. If this is the case a study of the teaching methods of Jesus ought to reveal these principles. Such a study ought to reveal the truth or error of religious educational theories. We have a multitude of these theories today. Some are new and as yet untried. Some of these theories are based on philosophical and psychological hypotheses which ought to be subjected to the most critical examination before they are made the basis of church school pedagogy. We propose to examine them in the light of the pedagogy of Jesus. The subtle affiliations of these theories are not always quickly and easily discoverable and it will probably take several chapters at the close of this volume to deal with the most important of them.

PART II

METHODS OF THE MASTER TEACHER

"When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things. And he that sent me is with me; he hath not left me alone; for I do always the things that are pleasing to him."—*John* 8: 28b, 29.

CHAPTER IV

Lessons Taught by Jacob's Well

In a preceding chapter we considered some evidences which indicate that Jesus is the greatest teacher the world has ever known. In the present chapter we are to be more specific. We are to examine one of the New Testament passages which shows him at work teaching. There is perhaps no portion of the New Testament better fitted for our purpose than the first part of the fourth chapter of John. These verses tell us of the conversation between Jesus and the woman of Samaria. When there is a teacher and a single pupil, the teaching process is reduced to its simplest form and we can follow the process more closely than is possible when the teacher has a whole class before him. Fortunately the narrative gives us, if not a comprehensive and exhaustive description, at least an outline of the teaching methods which Jesus used on this occasion. The passage therefore presents an unusual opportunity for the discovery of how the Master Teacher taught.

Some Elements in the Personality of the Great Teacher. A study of the pedagogy of Jesus would be defective if it did not make use of every opportunity to discover the personality of the Great Teacher. As we have already said it was first of all

the matchless personality of Jesus that made his teaching so effective. Those who would become in any measure teachers like their Lord, or who would help others to become such, should keep this fact in mind. The first six verses of the chapter we have selected bear a message concerning the personality of Jesus.

Kindly consideration for other people is the soul of courtesy. Jesus was courteous. The disciples of John the Baptist had heard rumors concerning the growing popularity of Jesus. They had probably noted that the multitudes were forsaking their leader in order to gather about the new Teacher from Nazareth. The Pharisees too were keeping close watch on the course of events and had noted the fact that John's followers were forsaking him. They may have used this fact to belittle the whole popular movement which had come about through the preaching of John and which was now turning toward Jesus. Perhaps they said now as they said on another occasion, "These people that know not the Law are accursed."

At all events, when Jesus heard that the disciples of John were concerned about the course which events were taking and when he heard what was happening among the Pharisees, he left Judæa and departed into Galilee. He probably did so in order that he might not embarrass his great Forerunner. He had just begun his Judæan work and prospects were encouraging. The multitudes were flocking to hear him preach. Nicodemus had come to confer with him and had intimated that he was not the

only Pharisee who believed that Jesus was a teacher come from God. John was too nobly unselfish to care because the popularity of Jesus was growing and his own popularity fading, and Jesus doubtless knew this to be the case; but the disciples of John were troubled and we may believe that, out of kindly consideration for them, Jesus gave up, for the time, his work in Judæa and returned to Galilee. There is a kind of professional courtesy among the teachers of our best public schools which is sometimes lacking in the schools of the Church. This ought not to be the case. The world's greatest Teacher of religion was courteous.

The teacher of the Christian religion must have a spirit of wide and genuine fellowship with all sorts of people. He must be democratic. There are many New Testament passages which indicate that Jesus had this spirit. The passage we are considering bears witness to the democratic spirit of our Master. The Jews of Galilee were accustomed, when they went to Jerusalem, to descend into the Jordan valley; crossing that stream below the Sea of Galilee, they journeyed down its eastern bank to a point opposite Jericho; then recrossing the river they climbed the long hill to Jerusalem. They pursued this long and circuitous route to avoid setting foot on the soil of the despised Samaritans. Jesus would make no such concession to race prejudice; "He must needs pass through Samaria."

The teacher of the Christian religion must be a diligent worker. Jesus and his disciples reached Jacob's well at the noon hour. Their road had been

rough and steep. Jesus was wearied by the journey and sat down by the well to rest while the disciples went to a nearby village to buy food. A woman came to draw water at the well. It would take but a moment for the woman to let her water jar down into the well and draw it up again, but Jesus seized the opportunity which that moment offered. He entered into conversation with the woman.

These few verses have given us three great words: courtesy, democracy, diligence. They are of immeasurable importance in the character of one who would be a true and efficient teacher of the Christian religion. The Great Teacher possessed them in perfection.

STEPS IN THE TEACHING PROCESS

The attempt to divide the teaching process into formal steps is somewhat discredited in modern pedagogy. This discredit is partly due, no doubt, to the fact that an effort to make all teaching conform to fixed formulas leads to a mechanical process which is far from ideal teaching. Teaching must be free to take the course the occasion demands. It cannot be tied down rigidly to fixed formulas without becoming mechanical and inefficient. Nevertheless, efficient teaching is apt to follow certain lines of procedure, which can be more or less definitely stated and predicted. Teaching takes certain directions because of the nature of human consciousness and the laws of the learning process. We need not be surprised therefore to discover that

there are certain rather clearly defined steps in the teaching methods of Jesus. There was both law and freedom in the methods which he used.

Establishing Right Relationships Between Teacher and Pupil. Relations of confidence and good will between teacher and pupil are helpful even in the teaching of secular subjects. A boy who has lagged behind his class in arithmetic may make rapid progress after coming under the instruction of a teacher whom he admires and respects. Relationships of confidence and good will are far more helpful in religious education than they are in secular education. They are, indeed, indispensable in the teaching of religion. A man who cares little for the pupil or the subject may be able to teach mathematics after a fashion. He can accomplish something because mathematics is primarily a matter of the head, but religion is primarily a matter of the heart, and only he who possesses it in his own soul can impart it to others.

With regard to personal relationships, conditions were very unfavorable as the Samaritan woman drew near the well where Jesus was sitting. We know from what the woman said a little later that she recognized Jesus as a Jew. She probably recognized him as a Jewish teacher. There must have begun to well up in her heart that old antagonism which had been growing between Jews and Samaritans for hundreds of years. Jesus was too great a teacher to attempt religious instruction while the woman was in such a frame of mind. He must first win her confidence and good will. He accom-

plished this in a masterful manner. He asked her for a drink of water.

The request of Jesus amazed the woman, and well it might. Jews and Samaritans had no dealings with one another. For a Jew to speak to a Samaritan man was unusual. For a Jewish teacher to speak to a woman of any nationality, save his own, was almost unknown. For a Jewish teacher to not only speak to an unknown Samaritan woman in a public place, but to take her water jar and drink from it was an act so wholly unprecedented that it is little wonder that the Samaritan woman was amazed. Jesus cast aside a half-dozen iron clad social customs of his day in order to gain an opportunity to teach the Samaritan woman that day by Jacob's well.

The request of Jesus did something more than astonish the woman; something which had more pedagogical value than the arousing of her attention and curiosity, although that was by no means an unimportant preparation for teaching. The request revealed the character of Jesus to the woman as hardly anything else could have done. She saw at once that he was not like other Jewish teachers. He was free from the bitter prejudice which had so long existed between the two races. Here was a Jewish teacher willing to be a friend to a Samaritan woman; willing to drink from the water-pot which her hands had touched. The request of Jesus laid the foundations for friendly relations between him and the woman. It made religious teaching possible.

This simple act of Jesus has an even deeper sig-

nificance than any we have yet mentioned. It was a request for service, for a kind act to be done to himself by the woman. We develop friendship and affection for those we serve and the friendship thus engendered is more profound and enduring than that which we develop toward those who serve us. The law of association has something to do with this psychic phenomenon. Service brings with it some of the deepest satisfactions of the soul and by the law of our spirits these satisfactions are associated with the persons we have served. The liberation and the expansion of the self which results from unselfish service thus knits the soul of the person who serves to the soul of the person who is served. Jesus showed himself the Master Teacher when he asked the woman first of all to do something, and to do something for him.

Prejudices which have been growing between races for centuries and which have immersed an individual from infancy do not fade away in an instant. The woman's ill will was disarmed, but the old grudge against the Jews was not entirely gone. It appeared once or twice during the early portion of the conversation. There is a suggestion of sarcasm in her pointed query, "Art thou greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his sons, and his cattle?" A little later she brings up the old point of dispute between Jews and Samaritans concerning the proper place for the worship of Jehovah. The request of Jesus for a drink of water had opened the way for religious teaching by establishing a founda-

tion of confidence in the heart of the woman, but the process was only begun.

Making the Transition from the Concrete to the Abstract. Jesus began his lesson by referring to something which was present in his own mind and in the mind of the woman. He was thirsty and the woman had come to draw water. He spoke of the water in the well of Jacob. At first they were talking about something material and concrete, but in a little while they were talking about something spiritual and abstract; about a well of water which springs up unto eternal life in the hearts of true believers. The woman was slow to comprehend the significance of the words which Jesus spoke. Perhaps she understood them better than she was willing to admit. Possibly she was only pretending that she did not see the spiritual meaning behind the words of Jesus when she kept on talking about the water in the well of Jacob when Jesus was talking about spiritual water. Any one who has tried to talk about religion to a somewhat unwilling listener will know that this attitude is sometimes assumed.

Possibly the Master Teacher detected something of this kind. Perhaps he saw that the woman understood him, but was unwilling to admit her need for that spiritual water concerning which he spoke. I do not think Jesus would have gone on with his plan until he was sure the woman had grasped the truth he wished her to understand. The time had come for a personal application of the truth to the

woman's life, but she was either ignorant of her need or unwilling to admit it.

Making the Application Personal. The lesson had arrived at a point where an exceedingly important, but indispensable step must be taken. The truth must not be left in its abstract form; it must find concrete application to the woman's life and conduct. "Go call thy husband and come hither," said Jesus. The woman was taken off her guard. The first instinct of guilt is to cover up, to deny. "I have no husband," declared the woman. She spoke the truth, but she probably did not intend to do so. She had lived a checkered career. She had been married to five different men and she was at that moment living in sinful relationships with one who was not her husband. The quiet Teacher answered, "Thou saidst well, I have no husband: for thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband: this hast thou said truly."

The conversation had become so personal as to be disturbing to the woman. She sought to turn it back into more general channels. She brought up the old point of dispute between Jews and Samaritans. "Our fathers worshiped in this mountain; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." The woman evidently thought that Jesus as a loyal Jew would champion the claims of Jerusalem and she would thus be given an opportunity to put forth the familiar arguments of her people concerning Mount Gerizim as the peculiar

shrine of Jehovah. The conversation would thus be relieved of its unpleasant personal aspects.

Master of the Situation. The skillful teacher must be ever the master of the situation. He may make use of situations as they arise, but he must not allow these situations to divert him from his goal. With a few pointed statements Jesus disposed of the old controversy, but he did something more than dismiss the matter in order to return to his previous procedure. He seized upon the woman's suggestion that he might use it for her enlightenment and salvation. "Woman, believe me . . . the hour cometh and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshipers. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth." Thus did the Great Teacher reveal the yearning heart of God; he "seeks" those who will be his worshipers. Thus did he reveal the continual presence of God in every place. The woman need not go to Jerusalem nor even to the top of Gerizim to find him. Not the place of worship, but the spirit and truth of worship is all important. The time will come when true worshipers will worship God everywhere, says the Great Teacher, and the time has already come; it is "now."

The Lesson Climax. Justification by faith in Christ is the fundamental principle of the Christian religion. As a doctrine this fundamental principle was emphasized at the time of the Protestant Reformation, but it did not begin then. It goes back to Augustine and to Paul and to Jesus himself. It

was the central goal of the Great Teacher. All his teaching by the well of Samaria led up to it. He established friendly relations with the woman. He spoke with her concerning the water of life. He revealed her sin and need. He revealed God as a forgiving and loving Father who was ever seeking fellowship with his children. Step by step he led up to the lesson climax where the woman might believe in him as the Revelation of God and the Saviour of man.

As the woman gazed into the eyes of that Teacher who had first appeared as a Jewish rabbi, then as a prophet, and now as more than a prophet, in some way her mind turned to the great hope of her people as it was the great hope of the Jews. "I know that Messiah cometh," said she; "when he is come, he will declare unto us all things." The lesson in the Christian religion taught by the Founder of that religion had now come to its climax. Simply and quietly the Teacher said, "I that speak unto thee am he."

The goal of the Great Teacher must ever be the goal of Christian education. We ought to teach citizenship, stewardship, and world friendship. Jesus taught as much. But we must not leave out that which the Great Teacher made central. We must not fail to bring our pupils into a knowledge of the God revealed in Jesus. We must not fail to bring about them influences which will induce them to accept him in faith as their personal Saviour and Lord.

Giving Religious Faith Expression in Action.

The Samaritan woman hastened from the well to tell her friends and neighbors that she had found the Christ. She must have borne enthusiastic witness for many of the people of the village believed on Jesus because of her testimony. It is worth noting that Jesus did not command the woman to tell her friends and neighbors about him, as he did in the case of the demoniac of Gadara. It seems reasonable, however, to believe that Jesus knew what the woman would do. To leave this action to her own initiative was skillful teaching on the part of Jesus. Spontaneous participation in the Christian enterprise is one of the surest indications that religious teaching has been effective. It is one of the goals which religious education ought to have in view. The teacher in the school of the church ought to do for her pupils what Jesus did for the woman of Samaria. She ought to establish relations with them which are friendly and full of confidence. She ought to make religious truth plain to them. She ought to make plain the application of the truths taught to their lives and problems. She ought to lead them to a personal faith in Jesus as Saviour and Lord. If this is done, the teacher will probably experience the joy of seeing her pupils launch out spontaneously upon the enterprise of making the whole world Christian.

Some Lessons for the Disciples. The lessons taught to the woman of Samaria were not the only lessons Jesus taught by Jacob's well. He was continually teaching and in the time immediately after the departure of the woman he taught some lessons

to his disciples. His experience with the woman had brought certain great truths into his consciousness and he wished to impress these truths upon the minds and lives of his disciples. Since these lessons give us some new light concerning the teaching methods of Jesus, we may be profited by a brief consideration of them here.

Making Use of Curiosity in the Teaching Process. After the disciples returned from the village they made ready the noon-day meal, but Jesus sat apart and made no move to join them in partaking of food. They said unto him, "Rabbi, eat." He answered, "I have meat to eat that ye know not." Their curiosity was aroused by the conduct and the words of their leader. They said to one another, "Hath any man brought him aught to eat?"

Curiosity presents an opportunity of peculiar value for effective teaching. Curiosity is a kind of felt need, a psychological hunger; by arousing it Jesus had produced in his disciples the mental condition needed for the presentation of important truths. He said, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me and to accomplish his work." Again we find the Great Teacher leading on from the concrete to the abstract, from the material to the spiritual. Physical food is before them. The disciples are thinking about it and desiring to partake of it. Beginning with this physical food which is able to satisfy the hunger of the body and capable of giving physical satisfaction and bodily strength, Jesus leads on to a conception of a spiritual good which is capable of doing for the soul of man what physical

food does for his body. It brings joy and satisfaction, power and confidence, vision and optimism.

Lessons for Those Who Were to Become Teachers. In thus instructing his disciples, Jesus was training those who should become teachers of the Christian religion. In teaching them about the rewards of faithful labor he was strengthening them for their great task, by lodging in their minds one of the fundamental facts of the religious life. Millions who have labored in the harvest-fields of God have borne witness to the fact that "he that reapeth receiveth wages and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." It is a fundamental law of life that participation in the enterprises which are peculiarly the enterprises of God gives the participant vision and optimism. "Say not ye there are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest? behold I say unto you, Lift up your eyes and look on the fields, that they are white already unto harvest."

Some Results of the Lessons Jesus Taught by Jacob's Well. We have already seen something of what the teaching of Jesus accomplished in the life of the Samaritan woman, how it turned her from being a woman of an unsavory reputation into a missionary and evangelist. Our consideration of this matter would be incomplete, however, if we pursued no farther our efforts to discover the outcome of that day's lesson by the well of Jacob. Truly great teaching must have enduring results. Is there evidence that these lessons of Jesus were great in this respect?

Many Samaritans Become Christians. We have

seen how the enthusiastic testimony of the woman convinced many of her friends and neighbors that Jesus was the Messiah. The woman did something more than tell her friends about Jesus. She gathered a company of people and led them out to the place where Jesus and his disciples were encamped by Jacob's well. At the invitation of the Samaritans Jesus and his disciples entered the village and remained there two days teaching and preaching. The ancient prejudices dissolved and when Jesus and his disciples went on their way they left behind them a village which may rightly be called Christian, since there were in it multitudes who had become believers in Jesus as the Saviour of the world.

By seizing a momentary opportunity to instruct one Samaritan woman a whole Samaritan village was brought out of the darkness to a larger light. The results of that day's teaching were not only enduring but cumulative. A new life for a spiritually needy woman, larger visions of truth for the disciples, a new social atmosphere for the village between Ebal and Gerizim; such were some of the results of the lesson Jesus taught that day at the noon hour by Jacob's well.

Samaria Becomes a Doorway to the Nations of the Earth. We have not exhausted our evidences concerning the results of the lessons taught by Jesus in the neighborhood of Sychar. In the Acts of the Apostles we are told how the Samaritans turned to Christianity under the preaching of Philip. A little later Peter and John came to Samaria and the work was still further extended. We may believe that

the response of the Samaritans was prompt and wide-spread at this time, because there were already many people among them who had accepted Jesus as the Saviour of the world. There was a Christian village there in which Jesus had abode two days and where the people had remained true to the faith.

Samaria was the gateway through which the Church which began at Jerusalem went out to the coasts of Palestine and Syria and to the isles of the Mediterranean and thence to the whole world. And the end of these lessons and their influence is not yet. John's simple narrative concerning what took place that day has gone all over the earth and the lesson taught the woman by the well has become a lesson for the human race. And its mission will not be accomplished until all mankind shall know and worship the God who is Spirit and who seeks as his worshipers those who will worship him in spirit and in truth. Has the world ever known another such Teacher?

CHAPTER V

Other Teaching Methods of Jesus

We have already seen something of the teaching methods of Jesus in our study of certain lessons which he taught by Jacob's well. Of course Jesus did not always teach in just the same way and therefore not all of his methods would appear on any one occasion. In this chapter we shall try to investigate a little more fully some of the teaching methods of Jesus which appeared in our previous study, also to gather information concerning other methods which he used. Religious teaching is something more than the presentation of religious truth. The process is not complete when the pupil stands convinced as to the truth the teacher is presenting. The intellectual phase of religious teaching is important, however, and we shall probably not get very far beyond a consideration of this phase of the pedagogy of Jesus in the present chapter. Our task is to discover how Jesus made spiritual truth plain to his pupils and how he sought to secure their assent to the truth he was trying to teach. The presentation of spiritual truth is such a prominent feature of the pedagogy of Jesus that we are justified in giving it our first attention in our efforts to discover the secrets of his teaching power.

Securing and Holding Attention. The first task

of the teacher is to secure the attention of the pupil. Without attention on the part of the pupil the attempts of the teacher will be in vain. The teacher must not only have the art of awakening attention, but the rarer art of holding it through the lesson period. Attention is a test of the teaching process. When the principal of a public school enters a room to evaluate a teacher's work, the first thing he notes is the presence or absence of attention among the pupils. He knows that if all the pupils are paying attention the teaching process is going on. He knows that if the attention of some pupils is fitful and imperfect the teaching process is going on imperfectly. He knows that if the pupils are paying no attention at all the teaching process is not going on in so far as the teacher and the intended lesson are concerned. Since Jesus was the Master Teacher, he must have had marked power to hold the attention of those who heard him; he must have used methods which are capable of attracting and holding attention. We shall now seek to discover whether Jesus possessed this power and, in so far as possible, to find out in what that power consisted.

Jesus Secured and Held the Attention of All Who Came Under His Teaching. If Jesus ever failed to secure and hold the attention of those to whom he spoke, there is no indication of the fact in the New Testament accounts concerning him. On the contrary, there are many statements as to the rapt attention which he inspired in his hearers. As a boy in the temple he listened with courteous attention to the doctors of the law, but they also listened

to him "and all that heard him were astonished, at his understanding and his answers." When he preached in his home synagogue at Nazareth, "the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened upon him." The common people heard him gladly and we are told that the multitudes "hung on his words, listening."

How Jesus Secured and Held Attention. Of course it was the personality of Jesus, quite as much as his methods, that aroused and held the attention of those who heard him speak; but we cannot draw a distinct line of cleavage between the two. The things he said and the way he said them, and the things he did, were expressions of his personality. Nevertheless, the methods which he used must have rested on principles which are discoverable and which will be of value to all who teach.

Jesus called for attention. He was not averse to asking for the attention of his audience, especially at the beginning of his discourse. He began one of his great parables with the words, "Hearken: behold a sower went forth to sow." Another lesson began with the words, "Take heed." He sometimes began to speak by saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you." He lost no time in gradually gaining the attention of his hearers; he had their attention from the first word that he uttered, and it may be that the character of this first word had something to do with his success in thus gaining attention.

Jesus aroused attention by what he did. In the synagogue of Nazareth there seems to have been something in his manner that fixed the attention of

the audience upon him. We can hardly think of Jesus as doing something striking in order to gain attention. Indeed, at Nazareth he seems to have read the scriptures, to have handed the book to the attendant, and to have seated himself before speaking in very much the accustomed way. The secret of his power lay in something far deeper than anything in the nature of the spectacular.

On a certain occasion Jesus was in the synagogue and there was present a man with a withered hand. The scribes and Pharisees were watching to see whether Jesus would dare to heal the man on the Sabbath day. Jesus said to the crippled man, "Stand forth in the midst." We can readily believe that as the man came forward in the synagogue there would be no lack of attention on the part of the audience. Every person in the place must have been keenly attentive as Jesus put his question to the scribes and Pharisees, "Is it lawful on the sabbath day to do good or to do harm? to save life, or to kill? Jesus held the attention of his hearers because he was courageous, plain, and uncompromising in the statements he made and in the things he did. The obscurantist in speech and the opportunist in action can seldom hold the confidence of large masses of people for any length of time and when confidence fails attention is apt to fail also.

Jesus used language which attracted attention. Not only the manner of his speech, but his words were such as to attract attention. His figures of speech were so striking and based on such evident analogies that they aroused interest. When he

spoke about false prophets in sheep's clothing, but with hearts like ravening wolves, the very vigor of his imagery was such as to hold the attention of all that heard him. On other occasions his language was so eloquently beautiful that it must have been well-nigh impossible for his hearers to have been inattentive. "Sell that which thou hast, and give alms: make for yourselves purses which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief draweth near, neither moth destroyeth." Thus with an eloquence chaste and impelling, Jesus set forth spiritual truths in a way that made these truths attractive, in a way that compelled people to attend to what he had to say. The teacher who can express truth in clear and beautiful language has a great advantage over the teacher who has not this ability.

Jesus was able to hold the attention of his hearers because he spoke of familiar things. He began his lessons with concrete illustrations and proceeded to the abstract only as his pupils were able to follow him. He spoke of a farmer sowing grain, of the birds and flowers, and of the swelling buds upon the fig trees in the spring of the year. From these concrete facts of experience he found a pathway into the more difficult fields of abstract spiritual truth, but the simple illustrations secured the attention of his hearers at the start and helped them to give heed to matters which were difficult for them to understand.

Sometimes Jesus caught the attention of his hearers by an apt and pointed question. He began

a lesson for the scribes and Pharisees with the query, "What think ye of the Christ? whose son is he?" At other times he made some statement so startling that it produced a sort of astonished attention. He began a certain lesson for his disciples with the assertion that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. Such statements express such profound spiritual truths that we can hardly call them hyperbolical and yet they are so forceful as to attract and hold attention. They arouse curiosity and set the hearer on a quest after an explanation, thus producing a favorable opportunity for teaching.

The ability of Jesus to hold the attention of his hearers is due in a very considerable measure to the fact that he had full command of his subject. Knowledge which is fresh, inclusive, and clearly conceived gives teaching power to its possessor. The teacher who has prepared a lesson thoroughly will have, other things being equal, much less difficulty in holding the attention of his pupils than will be the case with a teacher who has neglected such preparation. The thoroughly prepared teacher is never at a loss for new and appropriate and interesting materials whereby to illustrate the truth he is trying to teach. The poorly prepared teacher is apt to hesitate, to lose the thread of the thought about which the lesson centers, to be driven to the use of artificial and unrelated devices for holding the attention which a masterful presentation of the lesson truth would have assured.

Jesus began his lessons by talking about subjects in which his hearers were interested. He began his public ministry by preaching about the kingdom of God. This was a subject in which every loyal Israelite was interested. Moreover, under the preaching of John that interest had been aroused to an extent greater than had existed since the days of the prophets. Any message concerning the expected kingdom would awaken keen attention in the days when Jesus began to preach. The scribes were interested in the Mosaic law and its interpretations, so when Jesus undertook to teach a lawyer he began by asking him what the law of Moses had to say concerning the points the lawyer had raised. He could meet the lawyer on his own ground and where the lawyer's interests naturally centered.

The fact that Jesus spoke not only out of his own abundant knowledge but also out of his personal experience helped him to hold the attention of those who heard him. We are told that "the multitudes were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes." The teaching of the scribes was often lacking in interest because it was so impersonal. They quoted authorities, but could not speak out of their own glowing convictions and spiritual experiences, for their religion was coldly intellectual and pitiably formal. Jesus spoke out of his own deep and abundant experience and the contrast between the teaching of the scribes and the teaching of Jesus was so marked that it astonished the multitudes. The teacher of religion must know through personal

experience the religious values which he would impart to others. Without some such experience he can hardly expect to secure respectful attention to religious matters.

MAKING USE OF CASUAL OPPORTUNITIES

Jesus did not confine his teaching to formal instruction. He was evidently ever on the watch for opportunities to emphasize and explain spiritual truth. He seized upon situations and casual opportunities in order to give religious instruction to all who would hear. He did not confine his efforts to certain fixed hours and to certain chosen places. He evidently had a program, but he was always its master. He could bend his program to suit the circumstances of the hour. A teacher must possess unusual skill in order to be able to seize upon the casual remarks of pupils or the unforeseen events of the hour and make of them the instruments for imparting truth and the creating of ideals. This was one of the chief characteristics of Jesus as a teacher. We may be profited by a little more careful study of his methods along this line.

Informal Teaching in the Pedagogy of Jesus. One day Jesus and his disciples were in that part of the temple area where the people were making their offerings. They looked on as the people cast their gifts into the receptacles prepared for that purpose. Many that were rich cast in large amounts. After a time there came a poor widow who cast in two mites and then hastened away. Jesus seized this

opportunity to teach his disciples some important truths about giving. He declared that the poor widow had cast in more than all the others, because they had cast in of their superfluity whereas she had cast in all of her living.

On another occasion, a certain man asked Jesus to speak to his brother about dividing the family inheritance. Jesus evidently detected a covetous spirit in the request, for he refused to do as the man had suggested. Then he turned to his disciples and said, "Take heed, and keep yourselves from covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things he possesseth." Jesus then proceeded to tell the story of the foolish rich man who tried to feed his soul on corn.

Even the minor incidents of the day were utilized by Jesus for religious teaching. Once the disciples launched out upon the Sea of Galilee without taking bread with them for their noon-day meal. Jesus, learning of their carelessness, warned them to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees. At first the disciples did not understand the warning, but later they perceived that he was warning them about the danger of carelessness in a more important matter than the providing of bread for a journey; that he was warning them to be watchful lest the hypocritical spirit of the Pharisees should find a place in their lives. Their carelessness in an unimportant matter was made the occasion for warning concerning carelessness in a matter of much importance.

Jesus could pick up an item from the casual conversation of his disciples and weave it into a presen-

tation of some profound spiritual truth. One day a tragedy occurred in Jerusalem. A tower fell on eighteen workmen and killed them. The disciples were probably talking about the incident and according to the accepted explanation of such events in that day were assuming that these unfortunate workmen must have been persons of unusually wicked lives. Jesus used their chance conversation to teach a lesson which would give his followers larger and sounder views on such matters. He told them that the men who had been killed were not sinners above all others in Jerusalem. Then he spoke of a fate which was like that of the workmen and which was in store for the whole city unless it should repent.

Some of the greatest parables of Jesus grew out of these casual events of the day. Jesus sat down to eat with those whom the scribes and Pharisees called "sinners" and his enemies made sneering remarks about his choice of companions. In answer to these criticisms Jesus told the story of the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the lost son. The story of the Good Samaritan was given in answer to a captious question of a lawyer. Jesus utilized situations in which his disciples were more personally involved than is the case in the instances which we have studied. He found them disputing with one another and in dealing with that situation he taught them the truths they needed to know. He saw them stricken with fear on the stormy lake and made use of the situation to increase their faith, and to develop their knowledge of God.

Jesus Did Not Confine Himself to Informal Teaching. It would be a mistake to conclude that Jesus confined his teaching to the informal methods which we have been considering. He evidently had definite aims and he not only used occasions for teaching as they arose, but arranged for such occasions. He was in no sense an opportunist teacher. He went to a mountain top to teach and his disciples with the multitudes followed him to hear. What he said to them on that occasion was not confined in any narrow way to the immediate needs of the occasion. He dealt with general principles which were applicable to many different kinds of situations. When he taught by the sea he was not dealing with specific situations as such but with underlying principles, the value of the kingdom, its manner of growth, and the different ways in which people would respond to his message concerning the kingdom. What he said on that occasion was of course practical. It had a bearing on life; but it was not connected with specific situations in the sense that some of his lessons were.

In using casual events as opportunities for teaching, Jesus did not turn aside from his chosen goals, neither can it be said that he was merely helping his hearers to solve some specific problem. The solving of the problem was not so much an end as an instrument, a means of imparting truths and building ideals which would be applicable in a wide range of new situations. It is evident that Jesus had a body of truth which he planned to impart and that he made use of opportunities for imparting these

truths whenever these opportunities presented themselves. He was ever master of the situation and able to take up whatever his pupils might say, whatever they might do, or any chance happening of the hour; these casual materials and unforeseen circumstances he made the vehicles for the impartation of religious truths to his pupils.

The method of Jesus was therefore not at all that teaching process which is molded by chance circumstances and which changes its objectives with every change in the teaching situation. It is evident that Jesus sought to give his disciples certain definite and fundamental ideas concerning the personality of God, concerning the Kingdom of God as an ideal human society, that he sought to create in them certain ideals as to personal conduct. If casual circumstances could be used to attain his goal he used the opportunities they offered. If a formal and reasoned discourse on religious truth seemed to be the most promising method he used that way of approach.

A careful study of the methods used by Jesus in the teaching of his disciples indicates that while he sought to help them solve their problems as they arose one by one, his teaching was by no means confined to these immediate ends. He saw these momentary needs of his pupils, but his vision was not restricted to the immediate present. He saw the deep and widely inclusive needs of his pupils and we may almost say that it was these rather than the immediate needs of his pupils that he had chiefly in view. He had their future needs as well as their present

needs in view. He once said to Peter, "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter." He did many things which his disciples could not understand. He required them to do some things which they did not wish to do and could see no reason for doing. He "constrained" them to enter into a boat and to put out to sea when they would have chosen rather to have stayed with him, and to have helped the multitudes to proclaim him king. He set his face steadfastly toward Jerusalem when his disciples could only follow after him in an amazed submission. This point is of much importance. The true teacher of religion must have goals and objectives for the pupil which lie far ahead of any goals and objectives the pupil has for himself. The teacher must move on toward the attainment of these objectives and sometimes the pupil will not understand.

Teaching based upon casual opportunities is useful in meeting the immediate and felt needs of the pupil, but the teacher must keep in view needs which are neither immediate nor felt. To meet the religious needs of a pupil as they arise one by one is a vastly important part of religious education, but we can hardly believe that this is the whole procedure of the religious educational process, if we are to take the pedagogy of Jesus as our standard. He taught his disciples to pray when they felt the need of praying and came to him saying, "Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples." But he also told them that his death was an indispensable part of his mission when they were still quite inca-

pable of understanding the mystery of the Atonement and were quite unwilling to have the ministry of their Teacher thus terminated.

MAKING SPIRITUAL TRUTH PLAIN THROUGH A WEALTH OF ILLUSTRATION

The teaching of Jesus abounds in illustrations. He was evidently bent on bringing his pupils to a clear understanding of religious truth. If what is sometimes called "mere religious information" has no large importance in the teaching of religion, it is difficult to see why Jesus was so careful to illustrate and re-illustrate religious truth. The illustrations of Jesus were drawn from a wide range of sources. A mastery of the art of illustration presupposes a comprehensive and thorough knowledge. It likewise presupposes the ability to see likenesses and contrasts. It is impossible without an active imagination and the power to draw vivid word pictures.

Illustrations Drawn from Scripture. Jesus had only the Old Testament Scriptures, but he made large use of them in illustrating religious truth. Most Hebrews were familiar with the Old Testament writings and Jesus could therefore use them to advantage in his presentation of the larger and greater truths which he had come to reveal. Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness that those who looked upon it in faith might be healed. Jesus used this act of Moses in order to help his followers to understand how he was to become the Saviour of the world. In a similar way he used events in the life of David and in the story of Jonah.

Illustrations Drawn from Nature. Jesus lived in close sympathy with the natural world and he found in Nature abundant material for illustrating spiritual truth. He spoke about the beauty of the flowers, about the sparrows offered for sale in the market places, about the colors of the sky at sunrise and at sunset. He spoke of the development of the mustard plant from a tiny seed, and about the south wind which is prophetic of the sirocco. In the attitude of Jesus toward Nature there is something of fresh childlike wonder. For him Nature was a revelation of God.

Illustrations Drawn from Human Customs and Relationships. Most of the illustrations of Jesus are drawn from the manners and customs of the people in the midst of whom he lived. He found illustrations of spiritual truth in the labor of a farmer sowing grain, in the task of a tailor mending a garment, in the activity of a woman mixing bread for the oven. Some of his most effective illustrations come out of the home life of his day. He illustrated God's willingness to hear and answer prayer by citing the willingness of a father to give his children bread. He taught the compassionate forgiveness of God by telling the story of a runaway boy and a father who welcomed home the prodigal.

MAKING RELIGIOUS TRUTH PLAIN THROUGH VISUAL EDUCATION

Jesus was not confined to word pictures in his efforts to illustrate spiritual truth. He used object lessons. His use of visual education was less

studied and less dramatic than that of prophets like Jeremiah and Ezekiel, but it was doubtless better suited to his purpose than the methods of the prophets would have been.

Some Object Lessons of Jesus. Jesus once called for a penny to illustrate his answer to a question asked by the scribes and Pharisees. When he spoke of the beauty of the lilies, flowers were probably all about him and his disciples. Perhaps he held one in his hands. When he spoke of a mountain or a sycamore tree they were probably right there within sight of his disciples. Once he took a little child and setting him in the midst of his disciples commended to them the humility of the child as a qualification for citizenship in the kingdom of heaven.

Symbolical Presentation of Spiritual Truth. Religious symbols are visible representations of some spiritual truth or process. They have great educational value because they are in the nature of object lessons. They enable the mind to grasp in part truths which it otherwise could not grasp at all. Jesus approved of baptism as a symbol. He himself instituted that symbolical service which we call the Lord's Supper. In making use of symbolisms Jesus showed his supreme skill as a teacher. In giving to his followers the Communion Service he made available for their spiritual development truths which lie too deep for the mind of man to fully comprehend.

MAKING RELIGIOUS TRUTH PLAIN THROUGH QUESTION AND ANSWER

Socrates used the question-and-answer method of teaching so successfully that it has been named the Socratic method. Jesus, however, was more skillful in this method of teaching than was Socrates. In his eagerness to lead his pupils to some truth, Socrates sometimes asked leading questions. He in a way answered the questions for his pupils. Jesus never did this. His questions aroused thought; they did not discourage thought by making it unnecessary for his pupils to be mentally alert.

Questions Which Opened the Way to Spiritual Truth. The first recorded utterance of Jesus is a question: "How is it that ye sought me? knew ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" The question of the twelve-year-old boy was thought provoking. Joseph and Mary were not quite sure what the question meant. Mary pondered it in her heart for years.

The questions of Jesus are wonderfully penetrating. They go right to the core of some great truth. "And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Let any professed follower of Christ put that question to his innermost consciousness and he will find it peculiarly penetrating. Why do we call Jesus Lord and fail to do the things he has told us to do?

Answers Which Were More Than Complete. The answers of Jesus are as remarkable as his questions. They are more than complete. It is as

though he understood the mind of his questioners better than the questioners did themselves, and answered them in the light of his own perfect understanding. "Who is my neighbor?" asked the lawyer who had sought to entangle Jesus and to discredit him before the multitude. The answer of Jesus was the story of the Good Samaritan. This answer not only showed the lawyer who his neighbors were, but what neighborliness is. The lawyer was thinking of the term neighbor as an abstract term to be used in debate. Jesus answered in such a way as to make the term personal.

BREAKING DOWN BARRIERS WHICH HINDER THE ACCEPTANCE OF TRUTH

Jesus was aware of the fact that the acceptance of spiritual truth does not depend wholly upon the intellect. He knew about the deep-seated prejudices which warp the judgment. Consequently while we find him making every effort to enlighten the understanding of his hearers we also find him using other methods. In some of the succeeding chapters of this book we shall consider how he sought to influence people by an appeal to their emotions and by setting them at certain tasks. In closing this chapter we may consider briefly what we may call some of the "last resort" methods which Jesus used to open minds which had been closed by jealousy and prejudice.

Urgent Admonitions. Jesus did not simply make

spiritual truth plain and then assume a "take-it-or-leave-it" attitude. He urged the acceptance of truth. He spoke of rewards and penalties. His teaching is full of sublime admonitions. "I am the light of the world," he said, "Walk while ye have the light, that darkness overtake you not. While ye have the light believe in the light that ye may become sons of light."

Solemn Warnings. The Sermon on the Mount closes with solemn warnings concerning those who should hear the words of Jesus but fail to do them. Jesus told the scribes and Pharisees that they were in danger of committing an unpardonable sin. He told of a day of judgment when the righteous should enter eternal life and the unrighteous should go away into everlasting punishment. He spoke of a vain regret which should express itself in the gnashing of teeth. Religious teaching must be something more than the presentation of spiritual truth. It must have an element of warning, an element of earnest persuasion.

Scathing Rebuke. The great teacher did not consider his task done when he had made truth as plain as he could make it. He did not consider his task done when he had admonished and warned. He went a step further and rebuked the sin and guilt which caused some of his hearers to harden their hearts and stop their ears. Literature hardly offers a parallel to his scathing rebuke of the scribes and Pharisees. When he ceased to speak and turned from them, he had done all that a teacher could do.

CHAPTER VI

The Great Teacher's Relationships to His Pupils

The importance of right relationships between teacher and pupil has been mentioned in preceding chapters of this book. Before Jesus could teach the Samaritan woman religious truth, it was necessary to establish relationships of good will and confidence between him and the woman. Race antipathy and religious prejudice had to be taken out of the woman's attitude toward Jesus before the lesson could begin with prospects of success. This matter is of such importance in religious education and the New Testament gives us so many illustrations of the relationships that existed between Jesus and his disciples, that a further analysis of these relationships would seem to be desirable.

FRIENDLY COMPANIONSHIP

It is evident that friendly companionship was the most characteristic feature of the relations that existed between Jesus and his pupils. He lived with his twelve disciples. He traveled with them along the highways and bypaths of Palestine. He ate with them as they camped beside the road; and he ate with them at the occasional banquets to

which he and his disciples were invited. He was with them in the fishing boat upon the sea and with them in the midst of the thronging multitudes upon the land. He traveled with them to the coasts of Tyre and Sidon and thence across the rugged ranges of the Lebanon Mountains to the regions of Damascus. He was with them all the time save when he went forth alone to pray and think in some desert place under midnight stars. He hungered for their fellowship as the shadows of the garden agony were falling on his soul. It was this fellowship which made him their Teacher and which made them his pupils.

Friendly Gatherings in the Home. The earliest disciples of Jesus were attracted to him by his genial companionship and his perfect approachableness rather than by anything he had uttered in any public address. Jesus came down from Nazareth to the Jordan where John was baptizing. The day after Jesus was baptized, John pointed him out to two of his own disciples calling him "the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." These two disciples of John were Andrew and John the son of Zebedee. They followed Jesus and at his kindly invitation went with him to his place of abode. Many people who had come to hear John the Baptist were dwelling in temporary booths and it is probable that Jesus invited his newly found friends to one of these humble dwellings.

Jesus and his two friends spent the remainder of the day together. We do not know the subject of their conversation, but we know that Andrew went

out from that fellowship to find his brother Simon and to say to him, "We have found the Messiah." John remembered the event so well that many years afterward he could recall the exact hour of the day when Jesus invited him and Andrew to that humble abode beside the Jordan. Within twenty-four hours after the meeting of Andrew and John with Jesus, the first five disciples of Jesus had been won. They had all been won chiefly through the spirit of fellowship which Jesus manifested.

We have reason to believe that these home fellowships which were so important in winning the first disciples of Jesus were fundamentally important throughout his whole ministry. In Peter's home at Capernaum, Jesus was a guest and his presence brought a blessing to the household. It was before this home that the multitudes gathered at sunset bringing their lame and blind for healing. In a quiet home at Bethany Jesus found rest among his friends and there he spoke some of his great messages of truth. It was in an upper guest chamber of a home that Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper and gave his parting admonitions to his disciples.

A Hearty Goodfellowship. The gospel narratives reveal a hearty goodfellowship between Jesus and his disciples. We may almost say that their fellowship was one of jovial comradeship. In some cases Jesus discarded the names by which his disciples had been known and bestowed upon them new names of his own choosing. He called Simon, Peter, which means a rock. He called the sons of Zebedee, Boanerges, which means sons of thunder, or sons of

tumult. Another disciple had borne the name of Levi, but after he joined the circle of disciples he was called Matthew. Some of the other disciples are called by two different names in the New Testament and they may have received new names from their Teacher.

I doubt whether this giving of new names was a formal and ritualistic matter with Jesus. I suspect it was just an outcome of his intimate and friendly fellowship with them. People who are coldly formal are usually carefully exact as to names and titles. They do not feel inclined to bestow new names upon their friends and they are inclined to resent any such familiarity on the part of their acquaintances. We may be sure that there was nothing of this cold formality in the relationships existing between Jesus and his friends.

Jesus was accustomed to address his disciples as "Friends." He sometimes called them "Children." On one occasion they were in a boat out upon the sea and he was on the shore. He called to them saying, "Children, have you aught to eat?" The words of Jesus might have been translated, "Boys, have you anything to eat?" Jesus addressed a woman as "Daughter," and women addressed him as "Rabboni" which means, "My Teacher."

Jesus fellowshiped with his disciples and with larger groups of people as "one of them." His enemies seized upon this fact and sought to use it to his discredit. They called him a friend of publicans and sinners. They could not understand why he sat down with these social outcasts and ate with them.

It is little wonder that they were unable to understand the conduct of Jesus, for it was motivated by principles to which they were strangers. A saving fellowship of the righteous with the unrighteous was something of which the Hebrew prophets had caught glimpses, but with Jesus it was a rule of life. Such a fellowship rests on a conviction concerning the infinite value of each human soul and on ideals of universal brotherhood. These convictions and these ideals the critics of Jesus did not possess and they could think only of him as having fellowship with these disreputable people to his own discredit.

Among Them as One That Served. There is no arrogance evident in the attitude of Jesus toward his disciples. There is nothing patronizing and condescending in his fellowship with them. On the other hand he manifested a humility which is in harmony with his own declaration concerning himself. "I am among you as one that serveth." He did not seem to feel out of place as he sat and ate with publicans and sinners. When he washed his disciples' feet it was a service to them as well as an object lesson in Christian humility. Jesus could say of himself with perfect accuracy, "I am meek and lowly in heart."

We must comprehend something of the wonderful capacity of Jesus for fellowship if we would understand his power as a teacher. Such a fellowship is felt rather than apprehended by intellectual processes. Little children felt the fellowship of Jesus and it made them glad to be near him. Nicodemus, the learned teacher of Israel, felt that fel-

lowship and he never got entirely away from it. Zacchæus felt that fellowship as Jesus called him down from the tree, as he walked home with Jesus, as the great Teacher sat at meat in his house. The fellowship of that day made a new man of Zacchæus. When Jesus was crucified between two thieves, one of his comrades in suffering felt the fellowship of the suffering Teacher and in that fellowship his soul found peace and life. The other rejected the fellowship of the Teacher with mockery and reviling and he died unchanged in heart. What took place at the cross had been taking place all through the ministry of Jesus. There had been many who rejected the fellowship of the Teacher and these were the people whom even he could not teach. There had been some who, in spite of their inability to understand the course their Teacher chose, had nevertheless clung to him in a fellowship which could not die. These were his disciples indeed, the witnesses who were to be the heralds of a new age.

STRICT DISCIPLINE

Although Jesus mingled with his disciples "as one of them," although he was altogether democratic in his attitudes and took the part of a servant, he was still their Leader and their Teacher. There was law as well as freedom in his school. Mutual respect bound Teacher to pupil and pupil to Teacher in the school of Jesus. Jesus could mingle with his disciples "as one of them" and not only keep their respect but thereby strengthen their respect for him,

—an attribute of a truly great teacher. In a school taught by such a teacher, there is respect for rightful authority. There is discipline of the highest kind in such a school. This discipline may not manifest itself very often as asserted authority on the part of the teacher; but it is there, nevertheless, and its presence is felt. There is freedom, but not license in such a school. It may be thought that Jesus did not have to meet and solve the problems of discipline which arise in every school of to-day and which so often perplex the conscientious teacher in every kind of school. A glance at some of the gospel narratives would seem to indicate, however, that Jesus did meet these problems of discipline.

Training His Disciples to Make Right Choices. Many of the most difficult problems of school discipline are connected with the choices which pupils make or desire to make. Good teaching requires that pupils be allowed to make many choices for themselves; but there are times when neither the choice of an individual pupil, nor the choice of the whole group of pupils ought to over-rule the choice of the teacher. I think we shall find that Jesus had to deal with this problem even though he had only grown men in his school.

There is manifest all through the teaching methods of Jesus certain great objectives. One of these was the attainment of an enlightened conscience and a disciplined will on the part of his pupils, character traits which would enable them to make right choices. Much of his more formal instruction has this objective in view. He sought to

make plain the way of purity, service, and righteousness. He emphasized the responsibility of each individual for his life choices. He pointed out the consequences of right choices and the consequences of wrong choices. The house built on the rock would endure, but the house built on the sand would fall. He pointed his disciples to sources of spiritual strength where they might gain power to choose aright, for his teaching had much to do with prayer and he proclaimed himself the Emancipator from the slavery of sin.

Something besides what has been mentioned is necessary to insure right choices. This general teaching is helpful, indispensable, in fact, but there must be experience in choosing, before the educative process with regard to the establishment of right habits of choice is complete. Jesus was too great a Teacher to overlook these principles and it is not strange to find that he very often left his disciples quite free to make their own choices.

John the Baptist once sent two of his disciples to Jesus with the query, "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" John had been cast into prison, perhaps into the dreary dungeon of Machærus. He was a man of the out-of-doors and imprisonment must have been peculiarly irksome to him. He seems to have been overcome with melancholy doubtings as to the Messiahship of Jesus. He had pointed Jesus out as the Saviour of the world and the one whose coming he was to proclaim, but in prison he seems to have had misgivings concerning the statements which he had made. With char-

acteristic frankness John sent his disciples directly to Jesus with the question, "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" Perhaps the course Jesus was pursuing was hard for John to understand. He had foretold the coming of one who should cleanse his threshing-floor and burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. Jesus did not seem to be carrying out the kind of program which John had predicted.

When the disciples of the Baptist reached the place where Jesus was teaching and healing, they delivered the message which had been entrusted to them. Jesus made no immediate answer. He went on with his work of healing, teaching and preaching. Then he turned to the disciples of John and bade them return to their Master and tell him the things they had seen and heard. Jesus added the kindly admonition, "Blessed is he, who shall find no occasion of stumbling in me." Thus without resentment, without any evidence of offended dignity, Jesus sent the disciples of John back with a kindly warning based upon a perfect understanding of John's situation and his present state of mind. He uttered no negative and denunciatory word concerning the great man whose faith was beginning to give way. On the other hand he sent back evidences which John needed and the kindly advice concerning the path which would lead to blessedness.

Having done this, Jesus left John to reach his own decisions. There are some choices which because of their very nature must be peculiarly personal ones. The choice of Jesus as Saviour and Lord is evidently one of these peculiarly personal choices

and Jesus knew that John must, in the ultimate analysis, draw his own conclusions as to whether or not he had made a mistake in proclaiming Jesus to be the Messiah. It was the same method as that which he used when he said to his disciples, "Who say ye that I am?"

At that crisis of his career when his followers were forsaking him because he would not consent to be made king, Jesus compelled the twelve disciples to face the issue promptly and fairly. He said to them, "Would ye also go away?" He had been with them for almost his allotted time and had taught them the best he could; they must now decide whether they were to follow the crowds which were forsaking Jesus or whether they were to stand by him as the shadows gathered and the cross began to loom darkly in the offing. Religious education is a momentous matter; even after the teacher has done his best there remains the awful fact of human freedom. In the last resort the individual must decide. Training and education will make a favorable choice all but certain, but there remains the momentous possibility of a wrong decision. "Will ye also go away?"

Peter answered for the group and declared their loyalty to their Leader, but there was one of the twelve who did not, at heart, give assent to Peter's noble declaration. One of them had decided to go away. In the sovereignty of God there is room for human freedom and Jesus recognized the fact. Looking into the face of Judas, he knew that one of his chosen inner group of followers had forsaken

him. Judas had made his choice in a matter wherein each individual must choose for himself.

Perhaps one additional incident will be sufficient to establish the fact that Jesus at certain times and in certain matters allowed his disciples to make their own decisions. One day toward the end of his ministry he said to his disciples, "Let us go into Judæa again." The disciples were amazed and alarmed at the proposal. They said, "Rabbi, the Jews were but now seeking to stone thee; and goest thou thither again?" Jesus replied with perfect calmness, "Are there not twelve hours in the day? If a man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth because the light is not in him." Jesus evidently meant that he would go to Judæa and that he would go without fear, but he does not seem to have commanded his disciples to accompany him. It was rather by an act of their own choice that they decided to go with their Leader. They yielded to the noble devotion of Thomas who urged them saying, "Let us also go, that we may die with him."

Maintaining Rightful Authority. Jesus did not always allow his disciples to do as they chose. Parents and teachers are apt to stumble back and forth across the golden mean which separates law and freedom in the educative process. Too much law has often resulted in rebellion, or in the equally deplorable weak-willed condition of the suppressed underling. Too much freedom is apt to lead to self-willed anarchy on the part of the children in

the home and the pupils in the school. Jesus found the right balance between these two extremes. He allowed his pupils to make many decisions for themselves but there were times and circumstances when he followed another method. He sometimes demanded obedience. I think we may say that in certain matters Jesus was a strict disciplinarian.

I think we shall search the Scriptures in vain for any indication of an instance where Jesus sacrificed principle or lowered his ideals in order to give his disciples an opportunity to exercise their right of choice. He insisted on a direct journey from Judæa to Galilee through the territory of the Samaritans when in all probability his disciples would have chosen the customary route. He "constrained" his disciples to enter a boat and put out to sea when the multitudes were conspiring to make him king by force. He would make no concession to race prejudice, neither would he modify the program which he believed to be his Father's will. When his ideals in such matters came into conflict with his customary method of allowing broad freedom of choice to his disciples, the method and not the ideals had to give way. His educational program was no mere process of social experimentation. It was shot through with determining principles. It was built upon a rock foundation of truth. The Great Teacher was a Guide who led his pupils through educative experiences, but the discovery of truth and the alignment of their lives with eternal principles was a part of the experience through which he conducted them.

Dealing with Insubordination. When the rightful authority of the teacher is challenged by a pupil, or by a group of pupils, we have insubordination. Such a challenge is rebellion. It is the first step toward anarchy. Public opinion may often serve as a cure for insubordination, but in the ultimate analysis the remedy rests with the teacher whose rightful authority is challenged. I am not advocating despotic rule in the school. I have spoken only of the "rightful authority of the teacher." The precise boundaries of such authority we need not define. It is enough to recognize that such an authority inheres in the teacher of any school. The teacher of any school stands in the place of the parent and the parent has certain inherent rights and responsibilities which are not bestowed by the children of the home. The teacher has rights and responsibilities which are not derived from the pupils of the school. Parents and teachers are not despots, but as regards the children for whom they are responsible, they do have an authority which is not derived from "the consent of the governed."

Thrice in his career Jesus had to deal with something very like insubordination. Two of these clashes were with Peter. When Jesus announced that he was going to Jerusalem and that he would there be put to death, Peter declared that this should not be done. The seriousness of the situation is indicated by the severity with which Jesus rebuked Peter. He said, "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art a stumbling block unto me; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men."

Peter was the leader and spokesman of the twelve and if he had been allowed to have his way the other disciples would have followed him. It was insubordination born of loyalty and devotion, but it was insubordination, nevertheless, and Jesus had to check it promptly and effectively.

I think we hardly appreciate the gravity of the crises which arose in the Garden of Gethsemane when the motley throng came to arrest Jesus. The disciples had been told what would happen and they knew the will of their leader, but they were rebellious. They were still filled with that spirit which prompted Peter to say, "This shall not be unto thee." Peter drew his sword as the crowd came near and slashing out he struck the high priest's servant, cutting off his ear. The fight had started. Blood had been spilled. Nevertheless, Jesus was master of the situation. This was no time to give the disciples freedom of choice. It was a time for commands, for the voice of authority. "Put up thy sword into the sheath," said Jesus, and Peter obeyed. He obeyed even though the fighting madness was upon him and the heat of battle was in his veins.

I have said that we have records concerning three cases of insubordination in the school of Jesus and that two of them had to do with Peter. The third was connected with Judas. Peter's insubordination was sudden, fiery, unselfish. The insubordination of Judas was slow, sullen, secret, and selfish. Judas was the hopelessly incorrigible pupil in the school of Jesus. To be compelled to give a pupil

up is one of the hardest experiences of a teacher. Jesus had that experience. He had to let one of his chosen disciples go away. It was a choice between Judas and his mission, and Jesus chose to do his Father's will.

The attitudes of Jesus toward Judas during the last few weeks they were together exhibit the matchless character of the Great Teacher. I believe that Jesus saved the life of his betrayer that night in the upper room at Jerusalem. When the disciples learned that one of their number was about to betray Jesus, there was heart-searchings. Each seemed to look in upon his own soul and to realize that there were fearful possibilities for evil there. Each said in awed humility, "Lord, is it I?" But there were evidently searchings of another kind as these Galilean men of passion gazed into one another's faces. Peter made signs to John that he should find out from Jesus who the traitor might be and Peter had a sword at his side. I think Jesus knew the temper of his disciples and thwarted very real danger when he said to Judas, "What thou doest, do quickly."

Cultivating Right Relationships Between Pupils. The teacher has to do with other relationships than those which exist between himself and his pupils. He must look after the relationships which exist between pupils. A considerable part of the educative process inheres in this matter of pupil relationships. The school is a small world in itself and by Christianizing the relationships of the school the teacher is carrying on religious education of the

highest type. Jesus recognized this principle. He sought to build up a little company of people whose relationships should be characterized by love and service. He called his disciples his "little flock" and he admonished them to love one another as he had loved them.

The maintenance of ideal relationships among even a dozen pupils is no easy task. Jesus found it such even though all the pupils in his little school were adult men. These twelve men were very human and they had their personal ambitions and their individual peculiarities just as other people have. Sometimes their interests and their opinions clashed. More than once they contended with one another as to which of them should be considered greatest in the kingdom which they believed Jesus was about ready to establish. It was on one of these occasions that Jesus called a little child unto him and set him in the midst of his disciples as an example of fitness for citizenship in the kingdom.

On another occasion the personal ambitions of James and John led them into what may be called a conspiracy to outwit and defraud their fellow disciples. They sought to make sure of the highest places in the expected kingdom for themselves. They even tried to gain an unfair advantage over Jesus in securing his promise to grant them whatever they might ask, before he knew the character of their request, and they brought their mother along to reënforce their petition. Jesus would make no such blind promise as they desired and demanded to know what they wished him to grant them. They

were compelled therefore to reveal their request before it was granted and they asked that one of them might sit on the right hand of Jesus and the other on his left hand in his kingdom. They wished to be the prime ministers in the government which they believed would soon be established.

When the other disciples heard of this action on the part of James and John, they were indignant. The little company might have been torn asunder by jealousy and strife had not Jesus been equal to the occasion. He, with kindly patience, tried to point out to them the better way. He told them that the Gentiles thought much about such things and highly prized positions of power and prominence. The Gentiles lorded it over one another, but it was not to be so among the followers of Jesus. In that little company he was to be considered greatest who served most and humbled himself as servant of all. Jesus used an unpleasant incident, a menacing situation, to implant within his pupils high ideals, to train them in ways of noble living. Sometimes we wish that all misunderstandings, all unpleasant incidents, might be eliminated from home and school, but if we follow the Great Teacher we shall make of these incidents opportunities for teaching religious truth and occasions for training our children in righteous living.

UNDYING LOVE

John says of Jesus, "Having loved his own that were in the world, he loved them unto the end."

Jesus said of himself, "Even as the Father hath loved me, I also have loved you." In his matchless upper room prayer, Jesus said, "For their sakes I sanctify myself." We have in this beautiful love of Jesus for his disciples the explanation of his fellowship with them, the secret of his power over them. It lay behind all that he said and did. It was the ultimate source of his matchless power as a Teacher. It is his best gift to those whom he has commissioned to teach his religion to all the world. Without it learning and skill will count for little. John the disciple of Jesus became a great teacher of the Christian religion. He had become a great teacher, because his message was the message of Jesus and because he had become in some measure like his Lord. "This is the message which we have heard from him and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." "Our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ." "If we walk in the light as he is in the light we have fellowship one with another and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

CHAPTER VII

How Jesus Molded the Thought Life of His Pupils

The psychology of a generation ago recognized three classes of psychic activity, knowing, feeling, and willing. It thought of a self, or ego, having certain faculties which fall into a three-fold grouping corresponding to the three classes of psychic activity. The self, or ego, had an intellect, it possessed emotions, and it manifested will. It is now generally recognized that the psychology of that day erred in thinking too largely of these psychic activities and these faculties of the self as independent entities in the life of the individual. It is now agreed that thought has always its emotional accompaniment, that acts of the will are conditioned both by knowledge and feeling. The whole self and not a group of its faculties are involved in each psychic state. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the self does have these three ways of acting and most of our psychic states are such that one or the other phase of activity is usually predominant. There are times when our psychic activities are predominantly intellectual, other times when they are predominantly emotional, and still others when they are predominantly volitional. The old-time classification is, therefore, still useful provided that we keep in mind its limitations. In studying methods of teach-

ing, for example, this classification of psychic activities enables us to diagnose the educative process by breaking it up into its constituent elements, though of course no such separation of psychic activities would be always manifest in the methods of a competent teacher. We may, therefore, study the teaching methods of Jesus from the viewpoint of this three-fold classification without suggesting that the pedagogy of Jesus was marred by any such gaps and distinct lines of division as a mechanical adherence to the same classification would be apt to entail upon the teaching process.

The Imparting of Information a Major Objective of Jesus. The imparting of information has been given much attention in the conventional religious educational program. Of late this phase of the church school program has come under sharp criticism. We are told that church school teaching has made too much of mere informational instruction, that the teaching of facts about religion is not the teaching of religion. We are told that it is of no value to give religious information unless it is immediately useful in the solution of some problem in the life of the person we are seeking to instruct. We must deal with these questions more at length in some of the following chapters of this book, but for the present our task is to discover what use Jesus made of informational teaching in his program of religious education.

Information Intended to be Helpful in General Situations. Must religious information in order to be useful be fitted to the immediate and particular

needs of individuals, or may it supply more general needs, thus forming a foundation of knowledge which will be useful in a wide variety of situations? It seems clear that Jesus did not confine his informational teaching to the immediate and felt needs of individuals. He sometimes dealt with people in groups, in multitudes. He pointed out to people needs of which they were not aware. He evidently aimed at a general religious culture, and had no misgivings concerning the "transfer" of this general culture to particular needs.

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus taught certain truths about anxiety. He pointed out its futility. His hearers could not by being anxious make one hair white or black; they could not add to the measure of human life a single cubit by being anxious as to the span of life they were to attain. He sought to reveal to his hearers a remedy for anxiety in the thought of God's loving care for his creatures. He who cared for the birds and who clothed the lilies would care for them. Jesus evidently recognized the fact that anxiety usually arises in connection with things of only minor importance: clothing, food, drink. He knew that this anxiety concerning things of minor importance would be swallowed up in a great hope if the hearts of his hearers should begin to glow with zeal for the kingdom of God. He knew that anxiety usually arises concerning events which have not yet come, that anxious people are usually borrowers of trouble; hence he bade his hearers to cease being anxious concerning the things of to-morrow.

Now all this teaching had a bearing on the general situation of the people to whom Jesus spoke. They were mostly people of the common walks of life. Doubtless many of them were poor and had so long been accustomed to hardships that anxiety concerning food and drink and clothing had become ingrained in their character. They all needed the uplift which ennobles life when in the midst of sordid circumstances visions are given of high and worthy destiny. They needed the uplift which comes to every true seeker after the kingdom of heaven. Religious teaching must of course keep in mind these general needs of mankind else it becomes indeed a profitless procedure.

Information Intended to be Useful to an Individual in a Specific Situation. Sometimes the teaching of Jesus was quite specific. Sometimes it had to do with an individual and with some very specific needs of a particular person. Sometimes it was the kind of teaching which a specific situation demanded. One day Jesus was a guest in the home of his friends in Bethany. The home was that of Martha, Mary, and Lazarus. Jesus was continually at his task of teaching and although he had doubtless come to this quiet village and this home of his friends after the labors of a day in Jerusalem, he was soon speaking to a little group who gathered around to hear him. Mary came and sat at his feet listening to his words. Martha was cumbered with much serving. She probably felt that the reputation of the household for punctuality and orderliness was endangered. As she saw her sister sitting at the feet of

the Teacher and making no effort to aid her in the preparation of the food, she became more and more exasperated. At last she came up to the group and spoke, not to her sister, but to Jesus: "Dost thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone? Bid her that she help me." These are discourteous words to address to any guest, but when we remember that the guest was Jesus and that they were spoken in an Oriental home, we begin to comprehend how discourteous they were. "Dost thou not care?" of course he cared and Martha knew that he cared! He cared when the multitudes were tired and lay down in groups like scattered sheep without a shepherd. He cared for the lepers and the blind when nobody else seemed to care. But it is ever thus when we are for the moment victims of some over-mastering passion. It is then that we try to wound our best friends by striking them where we know the blow will be felt most.

A soft answer turneth away wrath. "Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things: but one thing is needful: for Mary has chosen the good part which shall not be taken away from her." Here then was a specific situation. Here was an individual with a need that was immediate and special. Without a sign of offended dignity, without any apparent thought of himself, but with a perfect and sympathetic understanding of his friend, Jesus gave the information which the situation demanded. It was the same message as that which he had given the multitudes on the mountain side, a message concerning anxiety about things of minor importance, a warning concerning

the eternal values which such anxiety is apt to put in jeopardy. Jesus sometimes gave information useful in general situations. He sometimes used formal instruction, if you choose to call it that. But he could use the same instruction in a very specific way when the occasion seemed to demand it.

He varied his methods to suit the occasion and we seem to see in his teaching a recognition of the fact that the things he taught had a value above and apart from method. His modes of teaching are in harmony with his sublime assertion. "The words that I speak to you, they are spirit and they are life." "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall never pass away." We shall become skilled teachers of the Christian religion in the measure that we attain to the teaching skill of our Leader. We shall be wise teachers of the Christian religion, if we bestow upon the words of our Leader that value which he bestowed upon them.

Methods Which Jesus Used to Make Religious Truth Plain. The teaching of Jesus abounds in illustrations, parables, contrasts, object lessons, references to scripture, explanation. Not less than a dozen parables have to do with the kingdom of heaven. He sought through parables to teach the value of the kingdom, its manner of growth, its glory, and its permanence. The kingdom which he had come to set up was to be like hidden treasure in a field, like a pearl of great price; it was to grow like leaven hidden in three measures of meal, like a mustard seed developing into a plant, tree-like in its proportions; it was to be established forever in that day when the Son of Man should sit on the

throne of his glory to judge the nations. To his parables concerning the kingdom Jesus added many terse statements concerning the nature and value of that society which he designated by the term "kingdom of heaven."

Jesus taught many other matters with the same thoroughness with which he taught about the kingdom of heaven. A study of his methods would seem to suggest that he looked upon the imparting of religious information as a matter of weighty importance. How may we otherwise explain his constant use of parables, object lessons, and Old Testament illustrations? The imparting of information concerning the nature of religion and its place in life and conduct was certainly one of the chief objectives of the Master Teacher.

In Dealing with the Thought Life of His Pupils, Jesus Did Something More than Impart Information. The present-day discredit of the informational element in religious education is due in part to the notion that informational teaching is a kind of mechanical transference of factual knowledge from the mind of the teacher to the mind of the pupil. Jesus dealt with the whole thought of life of his pupils. The facts which he taught his pupils were so full of meaning for their lives that there are never any evidences that his teaching of facts was irksome to his pupils. Religious education goes astray not in teaching facts about the religious life, but in teaching facts which have a relation to life and conduct so remote that they fail to arouse the interest of the pupil.

Jesus So Taught as to Stir up the Mental Ac-

tivity of His Pupils. Jesus did not always tell his pupils the things he wished them to know. He did this sometimes, however, for he had no established prejudice against "telling" as a method of teaching. Quite often he asked a question and left his hearers to work out the answer. Sometimes he made veiled remarks which attracted the attention of his pupils, aroused their curiosity, and set them to thinking. Sometimes he startled them into unaccustomed mental activity by a statement so unique that it produced astonishment. Thoughtfulness was one of the objectives which he sought to obtain for those whom he taught.

Jesus Corrected Erroneous Thinking in His Pupils. When the twelve disciples became his followers they came with a great amount of mistaken ideas as to the Messiah and the kind of a kingdom he was to establish. Slowly and patiently the Great Teacher corrected these ideas. Little by little he guided their conceptions into higher regions of value than those to which they had been accustomed.

He changed not only the content but the method of their thinking. Like other Hebrews of that day they had been accustomed to think of painstaking obedience to the letter of the law as the highest type of righteousness. Jesus taught them to think after another fashion. He taught them how to think in terms of motives. He led their attention away from the outward act to the inner thought and attitude which were the source of the outward act.

Jesus was continually correcting the thinking of his disciples. He did not hesitate to brush aside

long-established and almost universal opinions when he found them obstructing the understanding of his pupils. When the disciples came across a man who had been blind from his birth they concluded that either the man or his parents had committed some great sin and that the blindness was a punishment for this sin of the man or of his parents. Their thoughts were simply following the well-worn channels followed by the thinking of their time, but Jesus corrected their error. He told them that neither the sins of the blind man nor the sins of his parents had brought about this affliction. It had an entirely opposite cause. The man had been born blind under the providence of God in order "that the works of God should be made manifest in him." On another occasion he told them that the unfortunate victims of an unsuccessful Galilean uprising against Rome, were not sinners more than other men.

The Sermon on the Mount is full of teaching intended to correct the erroneous thinking of that day. The people to whom Jesus spoke had some confused ideas about the use of oaths. Jesus swept aside the current sophistries and set his disciples on a new pathway of thought when he said to them, "Swear not at all . . . but let your communication be Yea, yea; and Nay, nay; and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one." The rule of "eye for eye and tooth for tooth" governed the thinking of the Jewish people to a great extent in the days of Jesus. The Great Teacher set the current of thought among his disciples in an opposite

direction when he said to them, "Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also."

Jesus Taught in Such a Way as to Widen and Deepen the Thought Life of His Pupils. When Jesus gathered his little school of twelve pupils he found their thought life flowing in a narrow and shallow channel. He set before himself the task of widening and deepening the thought life of his pupils. Their thoughts concerning the kingdom of the Messiah were narrow, being confined within the limiting bounds of a prospective Hebrew nation. He must widen their conceptions of the kingdom to include in one vast brotherhood all the races of the earth. Their conceptions concerning the kingdom of the Messiah were shallow. They were thinking largely of a restored kingdom of David with the splendor and pomp which had reached its climax in the reign of Solomon. They must be brought to appreciate a kingdom of another kind, a kingdom distinguished by a moral and spiritual grandeur which the kingdom of Solomon never attained.

Jesus found his disciples thinking of the Deity in a narrow and shallow way. He was to them still in a large measure a tribal deity, a God who might be expected to burn up inhospitable Samaritans and find pleasure in the act. He was a God who might be induced to answer prayer, if by their much speaking they wore him out. Jesus set about the task of deepening and widening his disciples' conceptions concerning the Deity. He centered their attention on the fatherhood of God. He taught them that

God is a Spirit and that he may be found in any place and at any time by those who worship him in spirit and in truth.

The thoughts of his disciples with regard to human relationships and personal responsibilities were narrow and shallow. They, like the lawyer who made trial of Jesus, were constantly asking themselves, "Who is my neighbor?" They like him had been accustomed to answer the query by drawing limitations as severe as they felt the law allowed, rather than by the generous inclusiveness suggested by Jesus in the story of the Good Samaritan. They were not wholly free from the distorted standards which caused the Pharisees to value a sheep above a man. In their judgment the great man was the man who had many to serve him and who lorded it over many underlings.

Into this tangled skein of distorted and erroneous thinking as to human relationships the Great Teacher came, untangling the snarls, eliminating the useless and harmful, putting first things first and last things last, bringing order out of chaos, efficiency out of failure, and truth out of error. In dealing with the tangled and erroneous thought process of his pupils he was dealing with their very lives. It was only a shallow pedagogy which can overlook the importance of this sort of thing.

Some Special Objects in the Informational Program of Jesus. What has been said in the preceding paragraphs indicates that Jesus regarded the intellectual phases of the educative process as inherently valuable. He bestowed too much time and

effort on these phases of teaching for us to draw any other conclusion. The giving of information was an important factor in this part of the teaching process as it was carried on by Jesus. He certainly gave information to quicken thought, to correct erroneous thinking, to enlarge and deepen the thinking of his pupils. If the giving of information is an instrument for attaining these ends it is an instrument of no mean importance in the educative process. We have already discussed some of the major objectives which are evident in the informational program of Jesus. We have seen that he taught much concerning a Kingdom of God and the personal relationships within that Kingdom. He taught much concerning the person and the attributes of God. It was God who sent the rain and the sunshine. It was God who would establish the world-wide kingdom of brotherhood and service. He taught much concerning the worth and dignity of men. Little children were so precious that their guardian angels stood always before the face of God. These fundamental conceptions were certainly among the objectives which Jesus had in view, and there are a few others which ought also to be mentioned.

Jesus Taught Much Concerning His Own Personality and Mission. Jesus said of himself, "I am meek and lowly in heart," and his conduct was always in harmony with this assertion; nevertheless he had many things to say concerning himself, his place in the divine plans of redemption, and his unique relationships with the Father. He told his

followers that no man knew the Father save the Son and him to whom the Son should reveal him. He told them that he was the bread that came down from heaven. He compared his relations to his disciples with the relations of the vine to the branches and told them that apart from him they could do nothing. He promised them that in him they should have rest and joy, and victory over the world. We may be sure that one of the ends which Jesus had in mind in all his teaching was just this, that his disciples should know him as perfectly as possible, that they should understand who he was, what he had come to accomplish, and what he was able to do for them and for the world. "I am the light of the world," said he: "he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness but shall have the light of life."

Jesus Taught the Reality and the Menace of Sin. It would be well for us before we banish all teaching concerning sin and its consequences from our church school curricula to consider what place these matters held in the teaching program of the One who founded our religion. Jesus said that sin was not the mere outward act, but the inward state out of which the act sprang. He said that sin is a slavery, that all who commit sin are the bond-servants of sin. He warned the scribes and Pharisees concerning a sin that "hath never forgiveness." As certain comets sweep away from the sun upon a curve which has no return, so there is a sin which sets the sinner's face unalterably away from God. Reason as we may, Jesus certainly taught that the

uplifting on the cross was the only way whereby sinful mankind could be drawn to God. So long as we believe this, we dare not delete that part of religious instruction which has to do with sin and its consequences.

Jesus Taught Much Concerning the Elements of Personal Righteousness. Much of the teaching of Jesus had to do with the elements of personal righteousness. He explained and illustrated again and again such elements of character as humility, forgiveness, watchfulness, trust, fidelity, generosity, sincerity, compassion, charity, and reverence. He evidently considered a clear knowledge concerning these character traits to be a possession of much value, for he labored diligently to give his pupils a right understanding of these matters.

Jesus was not afraid of negative teaching. Practically every one of the virtues he taught was made vivid by being exhibited against the dark background of its corresponding vice. He set forth the pride of the Pharisee in colors severely accurate, then he pictured the humility of the publican's penitent prayer against this background. He described the forgiving spirit and the unforgiving spirit in one parable. In another parable five virgins were watchful and prepared and five virgins were slothful and unprepared. In the Parable of the Talents two servants are commended for their fidelity and one is condemned for his lack of faithfulness. Thus practically every virtue that he taught was made to stand out clearly. He explained, compared, illustrated; then he went over the same

ground again, repeating the same process with new explanations, new illustrations, new comparisons. No teacher ever uses the methods of teaching which Jesus used unless actuated by a profound conviction that it is of utmost importance in the teaching of religion that the conscience of the pupil shall be enlightened, the understanding of the pupil made comprehensive and reliable. Any educational fad which discredits the importance of the intellectual phases of teaching contains grave menaces for the school of the Church. There is such a thing as relying too exclusively upon the intellectual phases of religious education and these phases of the educative process may be carried on in such an inefficient manner that they have little influence over conduct. The remedy for these failures, however, does not lie in the direction of a depleted program of instruction, but in the direction of a program of instruction which is ample, wisely planned, and rightly related to other phases of the educative process.

The Thought Life of a Pupil of Jesus. The ultimate measurement of the teaching process is to be found in the pupil. We have been considering the intellectual phases of the teaching process as it was carried on by Jesus. In the light of what we know of the laws of mind, his methods seem admirable. They are such as to give us grounds for believing that they would be successful. Are these expectations fulfilled when we study his pupils and the changes which his teaching wrought in them? What did his teaching do for any particular disciple; say the beloved disciple, John?

Of course we cannot isolate the influence which teaching has over the intellectual processes of a pupil in any complete way any more than we can have real teaching which is wholly intellectual in its nature. Nevertheless, we can given our attention to the intellectual changes in a pupil disregarding the emotional and volitional changes which we know must have accompanied these changes in his thought life. Viewed in this way what did the teaching of Jesus do for the thought life of the disciple John?

In the first place, it seems to me that the teaching of Jesus gave to the thought life of John a magnificent freedom. It liberated the possibilities for thought which lay dormant in the soul of that young fisherman of Galilee. The church fathers were right in choosing the eagle as the symbol of Saint John. His spirit soared until it swept the eternities within its vision.

The teaching of Jesus, and of course we include in that term the influence of Jesus, gave to the mind of John an unerring sense of values. That young Galilean who was so ambitious for worldly honor that he tried to gain it by taking an advantage over his fellow disciples came to estimate values after another fashion. "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vain glory of life, is not of the Father but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth

the will of God abideth forever." John had once wished to call down fire from heaven to burn up a Samaritan village. There were doubtless children in the village as well as men and women. Under the teaching of Jesus, John came to have for children that high regard which characterized his Great Teacher. "I write unto you, my little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake. Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is begotten of God and knoweth of God."

The teaching of Jesus gave John accurate ideas concerning fundamental religious truth. That teaching had so much to do with God that John could epitomize its message in the brief statement, "This is the message which we have heard from him and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." It showed him the status of man as a sinner against the laws of God, but also the well-nigh boundless possibilities of man as a creature capable of fellowship with God. "If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his son cleanseth us from all sin."

Teachers of the Christian religion are helpers of the Great Teacher. An important phase of their task lies in securing for their pupils that intellectual quickening which we have noted in the thought life of the apostle John. Let no teacher of the Christian religion belittle or neglect this important phase of an all-important task.

CHAPTER VIII

How Jesus Molded the Emotional Life of His Pupils

We have seen how Jesus taught his pupils to think deeply, clearly, and accurately. His methods indicate that he placed a high estimate on the value of intellectual nurture. He was, however, something more than an intellectual guide to his pupils. There is no trace of scholasticism in his methods or in the materials which he used. He is never academic in his teaching methods or in his selection of subject matter. In touching the thinking process of his pupils he touched their lives. He dealt with life in its entirety, not merely with the thought process of his pupils. His teaching touched the emotions. We may be sure that his objectives were not mere intellectual ones. He nurtured the emotional life as well as the intellectual life of his disciples. An analysis of the methods which Jesus used to attain this end is the task which confronts us in the present chapter.

The Approach to the Emotions Through the Intellect. The lessons which Jesus taught had light for the understanding, but they had also an appeal to the emotions. He depended upon the law which certain psychologists have elaborated, namely, that the emotional activity of the individual may be

stirred up, directed, controlled, and developed by directing and controlling the thought processes of the individual. There are psychologists who have put forth the strange theory that the thinking processes always follow action and emotion as a result and do not precede emotion and action as a cause. William James said that when a man ran at the sight of a bear, he was afraid because he ran; that he did not run because he was afraid. Some later psychologists have gone a step further and maintained that in such a situation thinking comes along last of all as a result of the act of running and its resulting emotion of fear. As a matter of academic discussion the problem raised by James and his successors does not greatly matter, but when it is proposed that our whole system of religious education shall be constructed on this questionable hypothesis, the problem becomes one of momentous importance.

We shall deal with it more at length in some of the following chapters. Perhaps it is enough for the present to show that Jesus usually began the other way around, that he sought through the thinking processes of his pupils to touch and control their emotions. A few illustrations ought to be enough to establish this fact since it is almost everywhere apparent in the teaching methods of Jesus.

Gathered in an upper room on the night of the betrayal, Jesus and his disciples conversed with one another. The hearts of the disciples were heavy. They were beginning to realize that their Teacher was to be crucified. Their fondest hopes were slipping away from them. Their situation was desper-

ate. We may well believe that dread, terror, and sorrow filled their hearts. "Let not your heart be troubled," said Jesus, "ye believe in God, ye believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you: for I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I come again and will receive you unto myself; that where I am there ye may be also."

Now just what was the Great Teacher doing when he addressed these words to his sorrowing and terror-stricken disciples? Through what door did he enter the souls in which tumultuous emotions were contending for the mastery and speak the word of peace? His approach was clearly intellectual. He recalled certain facts to their minds, certain fundamental beliefs to which they had given intellectual assent. They believed in God. They believed also in him. No matter what some psychologists may say, faith even in its intellectual phases, has momentous importance. Jesus appealed to the faith of his disciples. In words sublimely beautiful he told them of the Father's house and its many mansions. He put an idea into the minds of his disciples and seemed confident that it would be enough. He directed their thoughts forward. He was going, but he would come again. This is not the place to discuss it, but we may well note the fact that the aims of Jesus went beyond the emotions of his disciples. He intended, in saying what he did, to help them to act heroically and wisely and righteously in the tragic emergencies just ahead.

When word reached Jesus and his disciples that Lazarus was sick and Jesus proposed a return to Jerusalem, the disciples were amazed and frightened. They said, "Rabbi, the Jews were but now seeking to stone thee; and goest thou hither again?" How did Jesus deal with the situation? He doubtless desired to go to Jerusalem and to have his disciples accompany him willingly. How did he overcome their fear and their opposition so that they actually went with him? His approach was again clearly an intellectual one. "Are there not twelve hours in the day? If a man walk in the day he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. But if a man walk in the night he stumbleth, because the light is not in him." Jesus probably meant something like this: "If we do always what is right and good; if we walk in the light as God is in the light; no accident can befall us. But if we lose fellowship with God and disobey his will we shall be like men who go stumbling onward in the night." Jesus certainly trusted that a few words would convey an idea, that the idea would arouse faith in the providences of God, and that emotions accompanying the idea would overcome the emotions of fear and apprehension in the souls of his followers. He was not mistaken. Action resulted. His disciples went with him.

In these cases Jesus was dealing with immediate situations, but he dealt in the same way with situations which he believed would arise in the lives of his disciples. He sought in the present moment to instill thoughts which would find a permanent place

in the minds of his pupils and which would safeguard them when the distant day of testing should arrive. "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is the Christ, or Here; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect. Behold, I have told you beforehand. If therefore they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the wilderness: go not forth: Behold, he is in the inner chambers; believe it not." What shall we make of all this, other than that Jesus employed instruction to safeguard his disciples through present crises and to safeguard them in crises which he believed would come to them many years hence?

The Nurture of the Emotional Life by Direct Stimulation. Jesus sometimes appealed to the emotions of his pupils more directly than has been suggested in the preceding discussion. He sometimes dealt with undesirable emotions in his pupils by direct and forceful reproof. When some of his disciples were angry and wished to call down fire from heaven to consume those who had displeased them, Jesus rebuked his disciples. When Peter manifested a spirit of rebellion he checked sharply and effectively the development of rebellious feelings in that somewhat turbulent disciple.

Jesus overcame undesirable emotions by introducing those which were more commendable. When his disciples were disputing as to which of them should be accounted the greatest, he took a towel and girding himself he washed his disciples' feet, thus

overcoming their selfish pride by making them ashamed of their selfishness. He sometimes relieved pent-up emotion by a calm question likely to divert the attention of his distressed hearer into other channels. To a raving demoniac he calmly said, "What is thy name?" To a father overwhelmed with grief and anxiety concerning his epileptic son he said, "How long has your son been in this condition?"

Emotion is deeply and subtly contagious. It does not always require the use of spoken words for its transfer from individual to individual. Perhaps the most essential element in the nurture of desired emotions in the pupil is the presence of these same emotions in the soul of the teacher. Jesus was teaching his disciples to feel when he wept over Jerusalem and mourned at the grave of his friend. He was teaching them courage when he steadfastly set his face toward Jerusalem although he knew that death awaited him there. It is not necessary for us to think of Jesus as manifesting emotion as a didactic device. He did however sometimes tell his disciples concerning his own emotional states. He said to them, "I have compassion on the multitudes because they have continued with us now three days and have nothing to eat." On another occasion he said to them, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." In their presence he manifested great joy in a thanksgiving prayer to God because his disciples had returned safe and successful from the preaching and teaching tour on which he had sent them.

Jesus did not hesitate to manifest his affection for his disciples by word and deed. He called them his "children" and his "little flock." He told them that they ought to love one another as he had loved them. Perhaps the kiss which Judas bestowed upon Jesus in the garden was a salutation in common use between Jesus and his disciples. John leaned back upon the bosom of Jesus at the last supper and the arms of Jesus must have been about the disciple whom he loved.

The Approach to the Emotions Through Activity. The psychic life is so essentially a unity that it flows freely in any direction. Emotion may lead to activity and on the other hand activity may lead to emotion. When Jesus asked the woman of Samaria to give him a drink of water he started in her soul friendly feelings toward himself. The disciples wished to send the multitudes away hungry, but it is safe to assume that after they had begun to carry food to the people seated on the grass they began to have more sympathy for them. When the understanding of the scribes and Pharisees concerning Jesus was so wholly clouded by suspicion, jealousy, and hatred that they could not believe him to be the Messiah, Jesus told them that if they would only do what he said, they would know that his claims were true. In this case he seemed to suggest that right acting would lead to right feelings and ultimately right thinking.

When Jesus called Zacchæus down from the tree and then invited himself to take lunch in the house of the publican, he called upon Zacchæus to do

something which would make him a friend and follower. When he said to his first disciples, "Come after me and I will make you to become fishers of men," he expressed a sound psychological law. By following him and by doing the things which he asked them to do they were helped to attain the emotional life which would fit them for their great task.

We may therefore conclude that Jesus utilized activity to nurture the emotional life of his disciples and likewise to quicken their intellectual perceptions. To what extent he depended upon this method and the circumstances under which he used it are problems which will engage our attention in the next chapter. They are problems which have a great deal to do with our methods of teaching religion and upon their solution will depend not a few fundamental conceptions concerning church school procedure. They ought, therefore, to be given more careful consideration than is possible within the bounds of the present chapter.

The Approach to the Emotions Through Mystical Religious Experience. We have seen how Jesus gave his pupils emotional education through quickening and deepening their thinking, through direct appeals to their emotional life, and through guiding them into activities suitable for arousing desirable emotional accompaniments. However, if our discussion should end here, we should probably miss the most important phase of the process through which the Master Teacher developed his fisherman disciples into the most emotionally potent personali-

ties of all history. There are deeper emotions in religious experience than any that may be stirred by the passing currents of thought; deeper emotions than any that may be called forth by direct appeal; deeper emotions even than any which may be developed by social contacts, however dear. Religion in its essence is an immediate experience with God.

If we recall the methods which Jesus employed in teaching and the content of his instructions we shall see that he aimed to guide his pupils into deep and abiding religious experiences. He taught them many truths concerning God. He taught them about prayer and he taught them to pray. He bade them go into the inner chamber that with closed doors and in secret they might enter into communion with the Father. He set them an example in prayer. He prayed in their presence and the inspiration of his worship caused them to come to him saying, "Lord, teach us to pray." They knew that he sometimes spent all night in prayer. They knew that before launching out upon his mission he withdrew for forty days into the wilderness that he might be alone with God.

Three of the disciples were with Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration. No matter what interpretation we give to particular details of the gospel narrative concerning Jesus and his disciples on the mount, we can hardly escape the conclusion that it was for the three disciples a profound and mystical religious experience. They with their Teacher entered that night into the world of eternal values, into the presence of God.

It is a significant fact that when his task of instruction was done, or nearly done, Jesus bade his disciples tarry at Jerusalem until they should be endued with power from on high. They were not yet ready to go forth as witnesses of the Christ. That which was still lacking was supplied on the day of Pentecost. The experience of that day was essentially mystical. The disciples were gathered for prayer and there came to them a peculiar awareness of the presence of God. The New Testament account tells us that this inner state was accompanied by what most people would call supernatural phenomena. There appeared as it were cloven tongues of fire which sat upon each of them. We may be sure, however, that it was their inner experiences that wrought such a marked change in the lives of the little company gathered in that place of prayer.

His own mystical relationship to God and the mystical relationship of his followers to God through him is plainly stated in the teachings of Jesus. He said that no one knew the Son save the Father and that no one knew the Father save the Son and he to whom the Son should reveal him. He told his disciples that any one who really saw and knew him had seen and known the Father also. He told them that in order to be fruitful they must abide in him as the branch abides in the vine. These statements of Jesus are figurative only in the sense that language must assume figurative form to express truths which lie well-nigh beyond the range of verbal expression. The methods of Jesus were

in harmony with his teaching, for as we have seen, he led his disciples to the deep and mystical experiences which he had set forth in his teaching.

It ought not to be overlooked that we have in our discussion now come to the very essence of the pedagogy of Jesus. If he had done nothing more than impart right ideas concerning human relationships, we could hardly call him a religious teacher at all. If he had added to this intellectual enrichment of his pupils a program intended to train them in right habits, we could still make no valid claim that he was preëminently a teacher of religion. But he taught his pupils about a personal God as well as about human relationships. He taught them to pray and showed them what prayer really is, and did not simply train them in right conduct towards one another. He led them to know and experience God and in this he was in the supreme sense the Great Teacher. No one can be a teacher of religion who does not believe in the reality of a personal experience with God and who does not include such an experience among his objectives for the pupil. He may be a teacher of man-made morals without it. He may train his pupils in right habits, to a certain extent, without it; but he is not a teacher of religion unless he teaches religion to his pupils and in its essence religion is immediate experience with God.

Human relationships may help us to discover God, but they are not God. God is not a mere projection of human relationships, an idealization, a personification of human attributes. If we make

social relationships our god, our worship is idolatry. A kind of worship of humanity is being promoted in our day. It is not in harmony with the pedagogy of Jesus, but it savors strongly of some pagan cults.

Emotional Transformations in the School of Jesus. The gospel narratives give us only glimpses of the changes wrought in his disciples by the teaching of Jesus, but even so we are given enough to show us that these transformations were deep, far-reaching and abiding. The transformations which he wrought in them can be called nothing less than a rebirth. In order to be specific, let us take the Apostle Peter as an illustration. What did the school of Jesus do for Peter in so far as the remolding and nurture of his emotional life was concerned?

Peter seems to have been by nature a man of strong but unstable emotions. He was anything but a rock when his Teacher, with a high vision of what it was possible for him to become, bestowed that name upon him. His instability quite disappeared under the teaching of Jesus. He whose emotional life had been so lacking in balance that a whole-hearted declaration of loyalty to his Teacher could be followed by a fervent, oath-emphasized denial of him only a few hours later, was completely transformed. Tradition tells us that Peter died a martyr to his faith and that he was loyal to his Lord unto the end.

Fear was an emotion which had a large place in the early life of Peter. It was fear that made him deny his Lord at the accusation of a young girl. He

was filled with fear on the storm-tossed sea. He was among those who ran away from the garden leaving Jesus alone in the hands of the mob. After Pentecost he gives no evidence of fear in any act or word which we find recorded concerning him. On the contrary he is characterized by a magnificent courage which is physical, moral, and spiritual. He preached a sermon in which he boldly accused the Jewish leaders with being the betrayers and crucifiers of the Christ. These same leaders rightly interpreted the boldness of Peter and John when they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus.

Peter's whole religious training had been such as to develop in him narrow sympathies; such as to build up abiding prejudice towards all people who were not Jews. He had been systematically taught that a large portion of the human race was "common and unclean." This unfortunate teaching had to be undone and opposite attitudes had to be developed. Peter doubtless shared the common Jewish antipathy for the Samaritans, but after he had been through the school of Jesus he became one of the first missionaries to Samaria. He doubtless shared the prevalent hatred of the Jews for their Roman conquerors, but after being taught by Jesus he welcomed a Roman captain into the fellowship of Christian believers as a brother and an equal. As a young man Peter would not so much as enter the house of a Gentile or sit at a Gentile's table. As an old man he wrote to people, many of whom were Gentiles, calling them his "beloved." "Wherefore,

beloved, seeing that ye look for these things, give diligence that ye may be found in peace, without spot and blameless in his sight." The Great Teacher knew how to teach world friendship and universal brotherliness and we shall be wise if we follow his methods and build on the foundations which he laid down.

Like the others who had become disciples of Jesus, Peter had joined the company partially from selfish motives. He was expecting an earthly kingdom. He had ambitions concerning the power and prominence which would be connected with official positions in that government which he believed Jesus would soon set up. Even after he had been with Jesus for many months, he was still capable of saying to his Teacher, "Lo, we have left all and have followed thee; what shall we have?" The egoism of Peter was replaced by a sublime altruism under the teaching of Jesus. His second epistle, like Paul's last message to Timothy, seems to have been written under the shadow of impending martyrdom. But Peter was in these last days thinking little of himself and much of others; little of earthly honor for himself, much of the spiritual good of others and the welfare of the Kingdom. "And I think it right, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that the putting off of my tabernacle cometh swiftly, even as our Lord Jesus Christ signified unto me."

What a transformation; from instability to rock-like fidelity, from cringing fear to heroic boldness, from narrow prejudices to wide sympathies and a

sense of universal brotherhood, from selfishness to a noble altruism! Such was the emotional transformation of Peter under the teaching and influence of Jesus. But we have probably detected only a few of the surface changes which took place in his emotional life. Who shall measure the deepening, the widening, the enrichment of the emotional life of Peter which took place under the influence of the Great Teacher? Perhaps Peter himself came nearest expressing it when he wrote concerning his having been "begotten again unto a living hope, an inheritance, incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away."

Jesus probably did as much for the emotional life of his other disciples as he did for the emotional life of Peter. Think of the transformation which must have taken place in the emotional life of Levi, the publican who became Matthew, the writer of the first gospel! Greed of gain made Levi a tax-gatherer, a traitor to his country, and an apostate from the religion of his forefathers. In the school of Jesus he became the biographer and interpreter of the Christ for the Hebrew people. Think of the transformation which must have taken place in the emotional life of that Simon who had been a Canaanæan, a member of the fierce and fanatical Sicarii, or Assassins, who went about always with their daggers beneath their garments thirsting for the blood of their Roman oppressors. To such as Simon, Jesus came saying, "Love your enemies; do good to those who persecute you and despitefully use you." Under the influence of Jesus men like

Simon learned to feel as their Teacher would have them feel, to do what their Teacher bade them do.

We hear much to-day about tests and measurements in religious education. There are certain proposed methods of teaching religion which may well be subjected to a testing "under controlled conditions" before they are accepted as having great value. Nevertheless, we ought not to forget that the Christian religion has a history. In teaching the Christian religion we are not offering "new and cunningly devised fables." All our methods and our subject matter does not need to be tested before any dependence can be placed on them. We know that Jesus taught effectively, so effectively that he is rightly regarded as the world's greatest Teacher of religion. We know something of what he taught and how he taught it. We know that teaching which is like his teaching in method and subject matter will bear fruit.

CHAPTER IX

The Place of Expression in the Program of Jesus

We have been using the word "expression" as an educational term for only about a decade. As a technical term it is not yet clearly defined. It probably found an entrance to church school nomenclature through such organizations as the Christian Endeavor Societies. The meetings of these organizations were called "expressional" because in them young people learned to discuss various topics in their own words; they learned how to express their thoughts on religious matters. The term was soon given a wider meaning so that it came to include such educational activities as the dramatization of Bible stories. It is now commonly understood to be a general term for all those phases of the educational program wherein religious truths and principles are given expression in life and conduct.

Attempts have been made to replace the term "expression" by the use of the term "activities," but it is a change of doubtful value. A person may be active in a variety of ways. He is mentally active when he is attentive, or thoughtful. He is emotionally active when his feelings are stirred. "Expression" being a narrower term than "activities" is probably better fitted for technical use in the discus-

sion of educational matters. It is activity of a special kind, that which a person does as a result of purposive thought or feeling. It thus pertains more particularly to those phases of conduct which are volitional. The objections to the term "expression" have for the most part originated with people who hold to psychological interpretations at variance with the psychic processes which the term presupposes. To people who hold other psychological theories the term seems to be quite acceptable. The difference between these schools of psychological thought must receive our special attention in some of the following chapters, but for the present we will make use of the term in its commonly accepted sense.

Jesus Made Use of Expression as an Element in the Learning Process. If we think of expression as the carrying over into action of the religious truths and religious attitudes which have been established through teaching, what use does Jesus appear to have made of it in his educational work? An examination of the teaching methods used by Jesus reveals the fact that he used expression to open the minds of his pupils to new truth and to start within them emotional responses desirable in the pursuit of his educational goals. He used expression not merely at the end of his teaching effort but to a certain extent throughout the whole process. Sometimes he began to teach in that way. We have seen how he began his lesson with the woman of Samaria by asking her to do something for him. We have suggested that this activity on the woman's

part aroused her intellectual activity and started emotional responses indispensable to the ends which Jesus had in view. When Jesus said to the blind man, "Go wash in the pool of Siloam," he probably required the man to do exactly what he needed to do in order to develop that faith which he must possess in order to be healed. When he called his disciples saying, "Come ye after me and I will make you fishers of men," he required an act which demanded decision, which made necessary an expression of faith and confidence and trust. We have every reason to believe that in complying with their leader's request their act developed and established within their minds and hearts that which had educational value of the highest sort. Jesus once asked a rich young ruler to go and sell all his possessions and to give the proceeds to the poor. He was to do this as the first step toward becoming a pupil in the school of Jesus.

It is clear that Jesus did not always put expression at the end of a long period of instruction. We should be in error if we supposed that he followed as a regular procedure the giving of information first of all, then sought to arouse suitable emotional responses to the information imparted, and last of all launched his disciples out on some task wherein they could express the truths he had taught and the emotions he had inspired. There was nothing so formal as this in his methods. But shall we reverse the process and say that Jesus used expression well-nigh exclusively, that he informed the understanding only by requiring certain acts of his pupils, that he

had no other appeal to their emotions than the appeal through activity? Did he ever use anything approximating the information, emotional response, and expression procedure? Did his teaching as a whole reaching across three years or more, have any suggestion of adherence to this plan? These are questions which we must now consider if we are to avoid reaching erroneous conclusions concerning the pedagogy of Jesus.

Jesus Often Made Use of Expressional Activity to Complete the Educative Process. I think we shall find that the usual educational procedure of Jesus consisted in the arousing of thought, in the guiding of thought into desired channels and in its enrichment. Along with this informational procedure there was more or less development of the appropriate emotional attitudes. Finally there were suggestions concerning the practical application of these religious truths to the problems of conduct. Jesus was certainly aware that mere information may be void of any influence over conduct. He warned his pupils repeatedly concerning such an outcome. He ended his Sermon on the Mount with solemn words concerning the doing of the things he had taught. The man who had heard and who proceeded to do would be like a man who built his house on a rock; but the man who heard and failed to do would be like a man who built his house upon the sand. Not every one who addressed Jesus as Lord would find entrance to the Kingdom, but only those who did the things he commanded.

At least once Jesus sent out his twelve disciples

on a preaching and teaching tour, on which he did not accompany them, but left them to carry on the work upon their own initiative and in harmony with their own judgment. Luke tells us that he once sent out seventy of his followers on a similar mission. There may have been other occasions when Jesus did this, but if so they are not recorded in the New Testament. Even so these are remarkable incidents. Centuries before educators had conceived of a training school where prospective teachers could be trained for their task through practice, Jesus made use of the principle on which the preparation of teachers is now so largely based. He sent his disciples to preach, teach, and heal that through actual experience they might learn to carry on the great task which he had in mind for them and for which he was training them. Jesus evidently recognized that there are some things which we can learn to do only by doing them.

Nevertheless, it would certainly be an unsound procedure to conclude from these incidents that Jesus made use of no other method of teaching than that which consists in the actual doing of the things education is intended ultimately to enable the pupil to do effectively. We must remember that we have only a few accounts of this type of teaching by Jesus whereas we have scores of accounts which reveal him teaching after another fashion. We must take into account the fact that he knew about this method of teaching, but did not use it exclusively and apparently did not even use it extensively. If there are those who insist that all teaching and more

especially all religious teaching must take the form of activity, they can hardly claim any large justification for their opinion in the pedagogy of Jesus.

On the whole the method of Jesus seems to have been to guide his pupils into right thinking, into right attitudes and right emotional responses; in other words to establish high ideals, first of all. He seemed confident that if these could be secured right actions would follow. He went behind overt acts to the inward springs of action, to the inner nature which expresses itself in outward acts. Actions were to be changed by changing the inner nature, rather than the inner nature changed by changing the actions. He did not hesitate to use right acting as an educational instrument, but it was also to be a fruit of religious nurture.

The Program of Jesus as a Preparation for a Great Task. It has been customary to think of education as essentially a preparation for the tasks of life. Religious education has been considered to be such a nurture of the religious capacities as will enable the pupil to perform his life work gladly, efficiently and righteously. This conception of education and especially this conception of religious education is to-day sharply challenged. We are told that pupils are living as truly during their school days as they will ever live and that the sole task of education is to enable them to live adequately and successfully in their present environment. Systems of religious education are being recommended which eliminate quite fully the preparatory element. They aim only to help the pupil

to live his present life, to solve his immediate problems. Preparation for life is declared to be a mere by-product of living.

This theory seems to overlook the fact that no matter how we may theorize about it, human life is for more than a score of years essentially preparatory. During this period physical preparation is going on. The body is getting ready for the tasks of adult life. During this period the mind of the individual is developing. The brain is increasing in size; the intellectual life is being organized. During this period the emotional preparation for adult life is under way. Certain emotions are increasing in range and intensity; others are being brought under more strict control. If it is maintained that this three-fold preparation is best attained by the individual living his youthful life as though there were no adult life for which conscious preparation should be made, there are one or two facts which ought to be considered. There are certain physical powers not yet manifest in the life of the child, but for which the body of the child is diligently making preparation. This preparatory development is not dependent upon use for the developing organs are as yet functionless. May there not be a possibility that the process going on in the body has concomitant processes going on in the mind and in the emotions? It is the business of education to fall in line with these deep tendencies of nature, not to run counter to them with a theory which conceives of human life as a matter of day-by-day experiences and choices. Momentary ad-

justment to environment constitutes well-nigh the whole of lower animal life, but it is not so of man.

Jesus was dealing with adult men as his pupils and if it is true that real education eliminates all elements that are distinctively and peculiarly preparatory, we should expect to find him dealing with his disciples wholly on the plane of their day-by-day experiences. Such is not the case. The educational program of Jesus was frankly and distinctly preparatory. He called his disciples with a promise that they should become fishers of men. The atmosphere in the school of Jesus was that of the forward look. The disciples felt that they were getting ready for something. We know that this was the case for that atmosphere is plainly evident on nearly every page of the gospel narratives. The attention of the disciples did not center in their daily experiences. Their interest and their attention centered in a Kingdom which they believed was soon to be established by their Leader. They felt that they were being prepared for great tasks in the expected Kingdom.

We may say in passing that the atmosphere of a commendable school is always that of the forward look. The teacher who can develop such an atmosphere is a teacher, indeed. Little children respond to it. They are naturally inclined to think in terms of "When I'm a man" or "When I'm a woman." Adolescence is fired and ennobled by it. It will be a sad day for religious education if the church school loses this atmosphere. Religion is intimately associated with the forward look.

The school of Jesus had its preparatory program and it had its distinct event when, that period being practically completed, the pupils of the school launched out upon the great task for which their Teacher had so diligently prepared them. After more than three years of preparation the Teacher sent his pupils forth to make disciples, to lay foundations for a new and better civilization, for a Kingdom of God on earth. Why should not the school of the Church be like the school of the Master? Why should it not be distinctly and frankly preparatory?

The School of Jesus Produced Men of Action. In preceding chapters we saw how the teaching of Jesus developed the intellectual capacity of his pupils. Fishermen and publicans were changed into some of the outstanding intellectual leaders of all history. We saw in another chapter something of the emotional development which the teaching of Jesus brought about in his pupils. The pupils of Jesus learned to feel deeply and purposefully quite as truly as they learned to think deeply and accurately. There is a sort of timidity manifest in religious educational circles to-day; a fear lest instruction may breed only barren intellectualism, lest a culture of the emotions may end in an abnormal and fruitless emotionalism. The teaching of Jesus certainly had no such outcome as we have just mentioned. His school produced men of action. His pupils were no academic theorists. They were no dreamy and impractical emotionalists. They did things. Out from the little company which had

been with Jesus went preachers who could stir the multitudes, missionaries who carried their faith to distant corners of the earth, reformers who set their faces against the enormous evils of a decadent civilization and injected into the world a new and saving element, martyrs who gladly died that justice and truth might live. If we teach as Jesus taught we need fear, as the outcome of our teaching, neither a barren intellectualism, nor an equally barren emotionalism.

Our task, then, is to discover the secret of the Master's power as a Teacher. We have gone far enough in this chapter to justify us in concluding that his power was not due to any educational procedure which centered exclusively in the expressional activities of his pupils. He asked them to do various things and it is evident that the things which they did at his request had educational significance, but by no sort of logical interpretation of the narratives concerning Jesus can we reach the conclusion that his educational program consisted largely of doing. It consisted chiefly in guiding, enriching, and widening the thinking processes of his pupils together with accompanying changes in their emotional responses and attitudes. He did not merely modify the passing conduct of his pupils, he reached the sources of conduct. Activities of his pupils were employed here and there in the teaching process and sometimes they held central place for a little while in his program, as when he sent his disciples forth on preaching and teaching tours. After the period of preparation there was action on a

heroic scale and the methods of the Great Teacher had evidently prepared his pupils for exactly such an outcome.

The Great Teacher's Conception of Religion. The program of a religious teacher will depend upon that teacher's conception concerning religion. If a teacher believes that religion is nothing more than "a progressive realization of a society of personal selves," that teacher's program will consist in a culture of social relationships deemed to be desirable. If a teacher believes that right social relationships are an expression of a religious life nourished by communion with a personal God who is something more than a personification of human relationships, that teacher's program will center in a nurture of those ideals and those mystical events, wherein such a God is known and experienced.

What we have been discovering in the preceding discussions ought to give us an outline of what Jesus conceived religion to be in its essence. For the sake of comparison we may first consider the definition of religion as it is formulated by an able theologian and careful student of religious psychology, Doctor George Foote Moore of Harvard University. Doctor Moore does not exactly define religion, but he does what amounts to the same thing; he names certain marks by which religion may be recognized. These marks are four:

1. [1]Man's belief in certain powers that do things to him.

[1] Quoted by Wieman in "Religious Experience and Scientific Method," page 361.

2. Belief that these powers are actuated by motives similar to his own.

3. Belief that he can induce these powers to behave in such a way as to help him or refrain from hurting him.

4. Action according to these beliefs.

Doctor Moore is evidently trying to think of religion in its simplest form, possibly of religion as manifested in primitive man, but his analysis is nevertheless suggestive. He conceives of religion as being first of all a system of beliefs and in the second place as consisting in certain actions growing out of these beliefs. The teaching methods of Jesus suggest that he conceived of religion as consisting in certain fundamental beliefs about God and about himself as the revelation of God, for he labored to build up such beliefs in his pupils. He taught other beliefs it is true, beliefs concerning man and service and brotherliness, but these beliefs were all related to the fundamental beliefs concerning God.

It is to be questioned whether even the religion of primitive man was quite so utilitarian as that suggested by Doctor Moore. Primitive man was not so very practical. He was a dreamer who allowed his fancy free play. His somewhat aimless wanderings in the field of thought, as his imagination sought for explanations of the phenomena of the world, probably had much to do with his religious development. While Jesus emphasizes the fact that God is in control of the universe, that he will provide food and raiment for his children just as he clothes the grass of the field and just as he

feeds the birds; nevertheless, the purely utilitarian relationship of God to men has quite disappeared in the teaching of Jesus.

Doctor Moore does not seem to emphasize the emotional phases of religion though he probably takes it for granted that the beliefs he mentions work out into actions through more or less definite emotional responses. We have seen how Jesus sought to nurture the emotional life of his pupils and his methods suggest the conclusion that he regarded right emotional responses as a highly essential element in a religiously controlled life.

Doctor Moore's explanation has no suggestion of religious experience, as such. He conceives of religion as consisting of certain beliefs concerning a personal Determiner of Destiny, as we may say, and of our actions resulting from such beliefs. As to the grounds of these beliefs, whether they are founded on fact or fancy, he makes no statement. With Doctor Moore, religion is simply a matter of certain beliefs and their resulting actions. With Jesus religion is something vastly more than this. He does not emphasize our ideas about God, but our experience with God as the essential element in the religious life. "This is life eternal," said Jesus, "that they should know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

While Doctor Moore conceives of religion as resulting in action through belief, Jesus believes in religion as resulting in righteous action through belief, knowledge, and experience wherein God is apprehended as personal and real. Religion as defined

by Doctor Moore might be nothing but a delusion born of mistaken beliefs and resulting in meaningless ceremonials. Religion as conceived by Jesus is not open to any such interpretation. He built his conceptions on principles which presupposed the reality of religion.

The Pedagogy of Jesus Rested on Certain Universal and Enduring Psychological and Philosophical Principles. We have in the preceding chapters discussed various methods of teaching which Jesus used. Sometimes these methods have been so obviously sound and so customary that some readers of these pages may have wondered why they should be discussed at all. Readers, however, who are informed as to current movements in religious education will not wonder why these obvious and customary matters are brought into our discussion. There is hardly a method of teaching which we have discussed and which we have found to have been used by Jesus, which is not challenged by some one today. We have interpreted his teaching as in some cases being concerned with the transition from the concrete to the abstract. There are religious educational leaders who regard any such educational formula as archaic. We have interpreted his teaching as the giving of information which was evidently intended to affect the actions and choices of his pupils. There is a large school of religious educators who maintain that any such procedure is bound to be barren of any important result.

If we have rightly interpreted the pedagogy of Jesus there is much in so-called modern religious

educational method which is diametrically opposed to the methods which Jesus used. At least there are many methods proposed as modern and scientific which are quite the opposite of the methods used by Jesus and which are founded upon psychological theories which are antagonistic to the psychological principles which seem to be inherent in the pedagogy of Jesus.

How shall we determine whether the proposed new methods or the methods of Jesus are more desirable? We may seek to reach a conclusion in several different ways. We may say we shall determine the merits of the two systems of pedagogy by their results. The method which secures the larger measure of desirable "outcomes" shall be regarded as the better. There are different methods of measuring results. In a preceding chapter we mentioned some of the results of the pedagogy of Jesus which have appeared during the past nineteen hundred years. Shall we wait some nineteen hundred years to see whether the methods of teaching which are put forward as substitutes for the methods of Jesus are really any better than the methods used by the Great Teacher? Our modern religious educators will of course say that they have in mind testing of another kind. They will test results by scientific standards and measurements and "under controlled conditions." Very well, the pedagogy of Jesus does not need to fear any honest testing, but we should like to scrutinize the measuring instruments which are to be used. You can prove almost anything you wish to prove if you have a free hand in building

the measuring instruments which are to determine the proof. You can get a bushel of wheat almost anywhere if you make your measuring instrument small enough.

There is another way in which the two different classes of methods may be tested. Each rests upon certain philosophical and psychological foundations. The methods which are put forth as substitutes for methods which Jesus used rest upon certain assumptions as to the nature of man, the quality of his consciousness, and his ability or inability to make real choices. It is to this line of approach that we must now address ourselves. We must take up, one by one, some of the more fundamental psychological and philosophical tenets on which some of the proposed methods which are most antagonistic to the pedagogy of Jesus are constructed. We must scrutinize them in the light of reason and history.

PART III

PHILOSOPHICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THEIR RELATION TO THE PEDAGOGY OF JESUS

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself: but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you."—*John* 16: 12-14.

CHAPTER X

The Ultimate Explanation of Human Conduct: Is It Mechanical Necessity or Purposive Choice?

The closing paragraphs of a preceding chapter intimated that we had reached a point in our study of the pedagogy of Jesus where a change of procedure seemed desirable. We have been considering the teaching methods of Jesus with only occasional and incidental reference to the fundamental psychological and philosophical principles on which his methods rest. Henceforth in this volume we will be concerned more directly with the foundation principles manifest in the pedagogy of Jesus.

It is with no mere academic interest that we turn to a study of the underlying principles of the pedagogy of Jesus. Momentous issues are at stake in the field of religious education at the present time. We are at the threshold of vast changes in our conventional modes of thought and our customary methods of procedure in so far as the teaching of religion is concerned. During the next few decades the Christian religion will be face to face with opportunities such as have not been presented for centuries; but it will likewise be face to face with dangers correspondingly great. Whether the Christian religion shall prosper through utilizing the opening oppor-

tunities of the near future, or shall fall a victim to the accompanying dangers, depends upon how certain problems just now prominent in the school of the Church are solved. It is with these problems that we are concerned in the following pages of this book.

Fortunately the most important problems at the present time in the field of religious education are rather clear-cut. In most of them the matters at issue are so fundamental that a categorical answer is demanded and likewise so clear that such an answer may be reasonably expected. In this chapter we are to consider what is probably the most basic of all these present-day problems of religious education.

TWO WAYS OF EXPLAINING HUMAN CONDUCT

The title of this chapter suggests that there are two different ways in which people seek an ultimate explanation of human conduct. There are those who have accepted as valid certain philosophical and psychological theories which cause them to regard all conduct as mechanically determined. They interpret conduct in terms of nerve structures and nervous reactions. They look upon consciousness as a meaningless accompaniment of a life which flows on under the impulse of purely physical laws. Consciousness in the theory of this school is not a cause of conduct but a result of it. We have already seen something of this school and its theories in our previous discussions. It is with this group that there

has developed the belief that thought and emotion always follow action as results and never precede action as causes. Those who champion this explanation of conduct believe that all the actions of men and all their mental states are due to an unvarying and mechanical necessity.

The other explanation differs from that we have just described in maintaining that conduct cannot be adequately explained without conceiving of some degree of purposive choice on the part of the individual. Those who follow this school of thought recognize the close relationships existing between nervous reactions and human conduct, but they do not conceive of these reactions as following inevitably and invariably the laws of physics and chemistry. They believe that consciousness is not a mere result of conduct, but that it may be a cause of conduct. They believe that conduct in the ultimate analysis is dependent upon purposive choices rather than upon the mechanics of the nervous system as a physical organism following physical and chemical laws. For convenience we may refer to these two explanations as the mechanistic explanation of conduct and the purposive explanation of conduct.[1]

Points at Which the Two Explanations Are in Conflict. The mechanistic explanation of conduct is associated with a psychology which denies the existence of a psychological ego or self, and with a philosophy which identifies experience with the adjustment of an animal organism to its environment.

[1] For an exhaustive discussion of the problem here suggested the reader is referred to the author's book "Psychological Foundations of Religious Education."

The purposive explanation of conduct is associated with a psychology which conceives of a self or soul and with a philosophy which conceives of mind and matter as distinct realities reacting upon one another. The mechanistic interpretation consists in a belief that the racial inheritance of the individual together with the past experiences of that individual have established certain brain paths which determine what that individual will do. A stimulus, reaching the central nervous structure of such an individual and finding certain openings as it were into nervous fibers, takes the path of least resistance and conduct follows as a mechanical consequence. The purposive explanation conceives of consciousness as coming in as a possible modifier of the nervous reactions. According to this explanation consciousness may lead to deliberation and reflection and emotional responses which eventuate in a choice whereby the stimulus results differently from the way it would have resulted had it been wholly subject to chemical and physical laws.

The mechanistic explanation is based on a belief that in the natural world there are discoverable laws which offer an adequate explanation of all phases of life and conduct. The purposive explanation is based on a belief that a narrow Naturalism is insufficient to account for all the phenomena of life and conduct; that physical laws, chemical laws, and social relationships are supplemented by laws of mind or spiritual laws which may enter in and overrule the lower laws of the so-called natural world. Of course these higher laws may be as truly natural

as the lower laws which they sometimes supersede; but the term "natural" is here used in its narrower sense.

Consequence of Each Explanation. Religious education is not much concerned with the philosophical questions we have been discussing. But it is concerned with the practical results of these philosophical problems. Each kind of explanation we have been considering has certain consequences which have far-reaching significance. These consequences in so far as we may be able to foresee them ought to be given due weight in our deliberations. In seeking an explanation of human conduct we are not dealing with a problem which is purely biological, nor with a problem which is purely physiological; we are dealing with a problem which is intimately related to moral and spiritual values. The experience of the race has established conceptions concerning a universe in which there is moral and spiritual law as well as physical and chemical law. We have a right to ask how our decisions as to the sources of conduct fit into this world which lies beyond biology and physiology and physics and chemistry.

On applying this principle we discover that the mechanistic interpretation eliminates all thought of human responsibility. If conduct is mechanically determined human responsibility is a myth. All our conceptions concerning it are meaningless "epiphenomena" which rise like a mist over a stream of events flowing ever onward under the relentless stress of mechanical law. If this interpretation of

life and conduct is true no human being is ever blameworthy. The explanation wipes out all moral distinction between the life nobly lived and the life spent in debauchery and crime; both are inevitable and fatalistic events in the cosmic process. When we reach conclusions which thus outrage our moral judgment is it not proof enough that biology and physiology as such do not furnish sufficient and suitable data for judging matters which lie quite fully beyond their particular sphere? Is it not a fact that such conclusions indicate that moral and spiritual problems cannot be rightly solved unless moral and spiritual values are regarded as real and moral and spiritual laws considered to be as valid as any laws of the physical universe?

The mechanistic interpretation of conduct is allied to a materialistic and mechanistic conception of the universe. It leads to a conception of impersonal law as the governing power of all that exists. Hence it leads logically to a doubt in a personal God. It disintegrates the belief in human personality when it repudiates the belief in purposive choice. In disintegrating the belief in human personality, it tends to dissolve the belief in a divine personality as the controlling force at the heart of things.

On the other hand the purposive interpretation of conduct makes a belief in moral responsibility inevitable. If man has the power to choose he must be conceived as being responsible for his choices. It makes impossible a conception of a mechanistic universe since it conceives of man as able to initiate

and accomplish changes in the drift of things. It strengthens the belief in a personal God in many ways, not the least important of which lies in the fact that if human personality is able to modify the course of events by purposive choice it is logical to conclude that there is an All-powerful Personality able to control Nature in its entirety just as man is able to control it in part.

It will be seen that a choice between these two ways of explaining human conduct is a momentous choice in so far as the teaching of religion is concerned. Our choice will determine not only our methods of teaching and our selection of teaching materials, but will affect our ideas as to the religion we are trying to teach. For the Christian the choice means a decision to abide by the foundation beliefs of the Christian faith or to abandon them. A purposive interpretation of human conduct is in harmony with what Christians have always believed and it is in harmony with practically every other religion that has ever held sway over the heart and mind of man. A mechanistic interpretation of human conduct is in harmony with nothing but an atheism, blank, materialistic, and forbidding.

A teacher who believes in the mechanistic interpretation of life deals with the pupil as a mechanism. His educational program is built on the theory that human conduct is a chain of three inter-locking reactions. A stimulus travels from some peripheral organ to the central nervous structures; there it finds preëstablished paths leading across from the sensory centers to the motor centers. This is the

"bond" of which teachers of this type have so much to say. Having passed over to the motor center the impulse passes out along the motor fibers and results in some action of the individual. This theory is not stated here for the sake of refuting it, but only for the sake of making as clear as possible the difference between the two ways of interpreting conduct. The teacher who believes in purposive choice is free to accept the explanations just given, but he does not accept them as an exhaustive explanation of all conduct. He conceives of consciousness as coming into the process at the point indicated as "the bond"; consciousness with its knowledge content, its ideals, its emotional attitudes. For a teacher of this kind the stimulus does not necessarily take the path of least resistance, but the path which the individual as a thinking, feeling, idealizing personality chooses for it.

The two interpretations are therefore perfectly statable in so far as the pupil is concerned. Teachers following one interpretation conceive of the child as a mechanism to be modified through suitable manipulation. Teachers following the other interpretation think of the pupil as a spiritual personality with a thought life to be enriched, emotions to be nurtured, and a will to be developed into right habits of choice. But what about the teacher's thought concerning himself? This question of course raises no difficulties in so far as the teacher who accepts the purposive interpretation is concerned. But what about the teacher who accepts the mechanistic interpretation of conduct? Is he

convinced that he, as well as his pupil, is a mere mechanism? Is there no purpose in his teaching? Educational theorists of the mechanistic school have had much to say about "the pupil." It would be enlightening if they would tell us something about themselves.

Relative Position of the Two Interpretations in the Thinking of To-Day. There are probably not many psychologists and educators who would support the mechanistic interpretation of life in exactly the form that it has been presented in this chapter, though there are some who would do just this. Many psychologists and educators however hold to theories which are practically the same as has here been discussed. Their interpretations are essentially mechanistic. There is a great army of teachers and other educational leaders who have accepted the findings of specialists dominated by the mechanistic interpretation and who are putting these findings into practice. They have accepted these findings as the conclusions reached by experts in psychology and education. They have accepted these theories as modern, progressive, and scientific, without scrutinizing critically the sources from which they have been drawn or the significance which they bear. Most of the educational problems of our day are rather intimately related to this fundamental problem as to the sources of human conduct. Most of them therefore cannot be satisfactorily solved until this fundamental problem concerning the source of conduct is solved. This is particularly true of the problems of religious educa-

tion, since religion cannot be separated from conduct without ceasing to be religious. With this basic problem before us we now turn to the teaching methods of Jesus. The writer of this book has of course indicated on which side of the controversy he stands, nevertheless, he will try to interpret the teaching of Jesus without prejudice.

OUR PROBLEM AND THE PEDAGOGY OF JESUS

The problem which we are considering had, of course, not been stated in its present form in the days of Jesus. Nevertheless, he probably came into contact with something not altogether unlike it. Centuries before Jesus lived there had been people who said in their hearts, "There is no God." Jesus talked with the Sadducees, the materialistic philosophers of that day, who denied the existence of angels and said there was no spirit and no resurrection. Jesus told the Sadducees that they were greatly in error. We are not limited, however, to a consideration of direct statements of Jesus as to the problems we are considering. He said and did many things which have a direct bearing on our problem and some of these we must now consider.

Jesus Did Not Believe in a Mechanistic Universe. We may say with confidence that Jesus did not believe in a mechanistic universe. He said that God sends the sunshine and the rain, and that not one sparrow falls upon the ground unnoticed by its Creator. He taught his disciples to think of a heavenly Father who feeds the birds and clothes the

flowers with beauty. He evidently believed that personality and not mechanical necessity was governing the universe.

He taught his followers to believe in prayer as a power which is able to change the course of human events and capable of reversing the course which natural events would otherwise assume. He put forth this truth in a form which his Oriental audience could understand when he told them that faith could move mountains.

Jesus Believed in a Self, or Soul, Which is Something More than the Body. We may say with assurance that Jesus believed in a self, or soul, which is something other than the physical organism. He believed that this self or soul survived the destruction of the physical life, for he bade his disciples not to fear those who could destroy the body only and after that have nothing more that they could do. He admonished them to fear God who has power to destroy both soul and body. He drew a clear line of demarcation between body and spirit, and declared, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, but that which is born of the spirit is spirit." The Sadducees believed that the bodily organism constituted the whole person and that when the body died the personality became extinct. Jesus refuted their reasoning by pointing out its inconsistency with what the Sadducees themselves believed concerning God and the scriptures.

This belief in a self or soul was something more than a theory with Jesus. The whole structure of his pedagogy rests upon it and in harmony with it

he lived and died. When faced by a subtle temptation in the wilderness and famished with long fasting he determined his course of conduct by this principle which differentiates the spiritual from the physical. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." He looked upon the soul as something of priceless value, something which a wise man would not exchange for all the wealth and honor of the world. Dying upon the cross, Jesus commended his spirit into the keeping of God. Psychologists who dig deeply into biology and are blind to all evidences which are not biological, sometimes persuade themselves that there is no psychological ego or soul. They have a right to their opinion but we who have undertaken to teach the Christian religion ought to remember that our Leader believed in a self or soul which is something more than the body.

Jesus Believed in the Reality of Purposive Choice. A careful analysis of the words and deeds of Jesus indicates that he believed in the reality and importance of purposive choice. His educational objectives presuppose such a belief. They all lie in the direction of a larger and truer apprehension of truth, a clarified and quickened conscience, and a deliberate choice of that which is good and true. There is not an element of his pedagogy which can be made a basis for a belief in the mechanistic interpretation of conduct. He held that people are responsible for their choices. He upbraided Bethsaida and Capernaum because they had voluntarily rejected the light and truth which he had mani-

fested in their streets. He wept over Jerusalem because it had refused to follow his teaching. The warnings, admonitions, and invitations of Jesus are meaningless if man has no power to choose. What can we make out of his pathetic question to his disciples, "Would ye also go away?" if we are bound to believe that the disciples had no real choice in the matter? What can we make out of his stirring admonition to the scribes and Pharisees, "Walk while ye have the light that darkness overtake you not," if we are bound to believe that those to whom he spoke had no power to choose any other course than that which they did actually pursue? Was the Great Teacher mistaken? Was he wasting his efforts when he called upon people to decide, when he upbraided them for their wrong choices, when he commended them for choosing wisely?

A belief in the reality of purposive choice underlies many of the parables of Jesus. He told of a servant who chose to use his master's money so as to increase the amount which had been intrusted to him, and of another servant who chose to bury his master's money in the earth. One was commended and the other was reprimanded. A certain rich man chose to live sumptuously while a poor beggar lay starving at his door, and God held that rich man to account for his hardness of heart. The prodigal son chose to leave his father's house and the father in sorrow let him go. He chose to live riotously and his course of conduct brought him to poverty and despair. He chose to return, a ragged penitent, to his father's house and the father ran to meet him

and fell upon his neck and kissed him. The parable of the Prodigal Son is a picture of the relationships between God and his erring children and it proclaims the reality of the human power to choose. We can say with confidence that the Teacher who used a story like that held no mechanistic theory as to life and conduct.

Jesus recognized the conditions under which purposive choice takes place. He gave instruction and appealed to the emotions in order to make right decisions on the part of his pupils more certain. He recognized degrees of responsibility and corresponding degrees of guilt in the case of those who were untrue to their responsibilities. He said that the sin of Pilate was not so great as the sin of the Jewish rulers. He prayed that those who crucified him might be forgiven, saying, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." He took into consideration that which we designate by the words *heredity* and *environment*, but he certainly did not regard these forces as determining what the course of the individual should be.

In his teaching Jesus seems to regard the limitations of human choice as arising not so much from the environment and the heredity of the individual as from the previous choices of the individual. He warned his critics to walk in the light while they had the light, intimating that repeated rejections of the light might lead to its passing away forever. He spoke of a slavery of sin. He warned his enemies concerning a sin which can never be forgiven, and the circumstances under which he uttered the

warning indicate that the path to this unpardonable sin lies along the line of repeated rejections of the good as though it were evil and repeated choices of the evil as though it were good.

Has Science Established the Mechanistic Interpretation of Conduct? There is an impression abroad in our country that the mechanistic and near-mechanistic interpretations of conduct are modern, progressive, and scientific; whereas the purposive interpretation is antiquated and unscientific. There may be people who will dismiss all that has been said about the pedagogy of Jesus and its bearing on our problem with the remark that Jesus did not undertake to teach psychology and philosophy and science, that he followed the established pedagogical customs of his day and that his methods of teaching have no significance for the educational problems of our times. This reply, we should note, does not modify the fact that Jesus was the greatest teacher of history and that his methods are in harmony with a purposive interpretation of conduct and out of harmony with a mechanistic interpretation of conduct.

We must not conclude, however, that all science is antagonistic to the purposive interpretation of human conduct. It is not our ablest physiologists who are putting forth the mechanistic interpretation of conduct, but certain physiological psychologists, men who are primarily concerned with psychology and only indirectly concerned with physiology. One of the leading physiologists of our country was asked concerning the "bond" which connects the in-

coming sensory nerve currents with the outgoing motor nerve currents and he replied, "You will have to ask the psychologists about that; we know little about it as yet, but some of the psychologists seem to know all about it." It is not from our greatest biologists that the mechanistic interpretation of conduct is receiving support, but from certain biological psychologists, men who are concerned first of all with a study of psychology and only indirectly with biology. It is well to remember that the psychologists who are supporting the mechanistic interpretation of conduct are not specialists in physiology and biology. In these particular fields they do not speak with authority and yet they draw from these fields conclusions which specialists in these fields do not consider well established. The type of psychology which would assume a dictatorial rôle in the teaching of religion is therefore not fully sustained in those fields from which it pretends to draw the data on which its claims for authority chiefly rest.

CHAPTER XI

The Highest Motives in Purposive Choice: Are They Found in Self-Centered Satisfiers or in Altruistic Ideals?

The discussions of the preceding chapter seem to justify us in concluding that purposive choice and not mechanical necessity lies at the foundations of moral and religious conduct. If these conclusions are true, we have already defined somewhat the task of the religious teacher. If these conclusions are true, religious education does not consist primarily in a program of activities capable of mechanizing nervous reactions in some desirable way, but in a program capable of developing the power of intelligent purposeful choice. Religious education thus defined emphasizes motive more than mechanism. With this foundation laid, our next step is to discover what motives are most capable of securing choices which are in harmony with morality and religion. When these motives are discovered, the task of the religious teacher will be still further simplified; it will consist in the nurture of these motives in the lives of pupils.

Classified with regard to the ends they have in view, motives are either egoistic or altruistic; they seek some good for self, or some good for others.

Of course these ends are not always mutually exclusive. Perhaps in the ultimate analysis the highest good of each individual person is identical with the highest good of all people. Nevertheless, in actual choosing, most people fall into either egoistic or altruistic habits of choice. Some people have selfish ends either consciously or unconsciously in view in practically all they do. Other people are truly self-forgetful, their devotion being to some great cause or principle, perhaps to the good of their fellowmen. Religious education, it would appear, is primarily concerned with these basic motives of life and conduct. It must seek the highest motives for conduct and persistently strive to develop these motives in the pupil.

What are these highest motives? Is it possible to develop motives which are purely altruistic, or is altruism only egoism in its higher forms? Is there always some conscious, sub-conscious, or unconscious reference to the self, even in our most unselfish choices? Shall we, as teachers of the Christian religion, dare to challenge our pupils with an absolute altruism; or must we limit our efforts by a constant belief that, in the ultimate analysis, all the pupil's choices are made with reference to their effect upon himself? These questions are being answered in different ways by different schools of religious education. They are fundamentally important and they must be answered in some fashion before we can have a consistent program of religious teaching. They must be answered right before we can have an efficient program of Christian education, for they

have to do with matters of weighty importance in the Christian religion.

The Annoyer-Satisfier Psychology and Its Methods of Motivating Conduct. There is a type of psychology which has much to say about "annoyers" and "satisfiers" of the organism. It seeks to explain human conduct chiefly in terms of these "annoyers" and "satisfiers." Most of our experiences do bring us either satisfaction or annoyance, it is true. These experiences do influence our conduct. We are apt to seek again the experiences which have brought satisfaction and to avoid the experiences which have resulted in annoyance. But just how large a rôle does this fact have in the determination of our conduct? Do "annoyers" and "satisfiers" act automatically? Do they have so much to do with conduct that we can build a system of education upon them? Are they the right foundation for a program of religious education? A serious student of religious education will ponder questions like these and he will make certain investigations before he jumps to conclusions concerning this theory.

Origin of the Annoyer-Satisfier Theory. The Annoyer-Satisfier theory has been developed chiefly by Thorndike. He set it forth in a book entitled *Animal Intelligence.* He later embodied it in his three-volume work entitled *Educational Psychology.* The wording of the "law of effect" which appears in the work entitled *Educational Psychology* is almost exactly like the wording of the same law in the earlier publication. The theory as developed by Thorndike centers in this "law of effect" though he

has added certain other laws which deal with phases of the theory.

It is well to remember that this theory did not originate in the study of the human mind or in an attempt to analyze human conduct. It had its origin in the study of the lower animals. It was carried over into the study of human conduct, but it did not have its origin there. Further, this theory is held chiefly by those who are "Behaviorists" in so far as the gathering of psychological data is concerned. Those who champion the theory do not make use of introspection in their efforts to find an explanation of human conduct. They confine their investigation to outside evidences as to what is taking place within the individual. It is worth noting that beginning in a study of the lower animals, this theory has been extended to include the life and conduct of man, but it maintains this new position by a narrowing of the field of psychological investigation which largely eliminates the distinguishing differences between man and beast.

A Course in Religious Education Which Begins With a Study of the Amœba. In a search for annoyances and satisfactions in their simplest form, certain psychologists have studied low types of animal life. In at least one of our great universities students of religious education begin their course by a study of the amœba. They observe it under different conditions and note its behavior as these conditions change. When the amœba has food and the proper temperature it seems to be satisfied. When it lacks food or when its environment is otherwise

unsuitable, it manifests dissatisfaction, annoyance. Under the spur of this annoyance it develops certain types of behavior. When it is satisfied its behavior is of a different kind.

Students begin their course in religious education by a study of the amœba, because their instructors have outlined the course thus. The instructors have so outlined the course because they believe that in the amœba we have in embryo, as it were, the whole behavior of the human being. The highest types of human conduct, in the opinion of these educators, are only evolved forms of what we see in the amœba. Here, they believe, is the beginning of all that mankind exhibits in life and action. They believe that in understanding this beginning of animal behavior we shall find the key to all types of human behavior. The same "annoyers" and "satisfiers" which underlie the behavior of the amœba, are the determining factors in human life. The conduct of man has evolved from the behavior of the amœba as the oak evolves from the acorn. In man annoyances and satisfactions arise in connection with intellectual and social needs as well as in connection with psychical needs; but even these higher needs of man exist within his nervous structures, according to this theory, and the same law runs all the way through the animal creation from the amœba at its lowest state to man at his highest state.

Religious Pedagogy of the Annoyer-Satisfier Type. The "Annoyer-Satisfier" theory has of late secured a remarkable hold on religious education. Education is a very simple matter to the teacher

who has accepted this theory at its face value and admitted its claims to a determining influence in life and conduct. Such a teacher has a very simple educational formula: make desirable actions satisfying and undesirable ones annoying; the law of effect and its kindred laws will take care of the rest.

It is only fair to say that educators of this type recognize the necessity for developing in the pupil a responsiveness to the appeal of higher and higher satisfactions. With the little child the satisfactions are largely physical. With older children satisfactions arise in connection with the approbation of parents and teachers. Finally the individual finds his highest satisfactions in the securing of ideal social relationships.

Some Problems Concerning this Type of Psychology and Its Mode of Motivating Conduct. The "laws" of the Annoyer-Satisfier theory are now regarded as established by some educational leaders. It is proposed to reconstruct church school teaching on the new foundation. The theory, however, is too revolutionary to be accepted without careful scrutiny. It ought to be examined in the light of the problems which it raises. It is not enough to inquire whether it is in harmony with the biology of the amœba. Its application will not have to do with these low forms of life but with our children. First of all, we have a right to inquire as to whether the theory is built on a legitimate use of biological data. The facts of biology may have much importance, but this does not mean that they are to be given exclusive rights of way to the discrediting of facts from

other fields of knowledge. If man is a much developed amœba he must be studied in his developed state and not merely in his primitive state. When adherents of this theory thrust the findings of biology in the lower forms of life into such prominence as to displace from consideration the distinctive characteristics of man, they are indulging in a most unscientific procedure. They evidently do this very thing when they exclude from consideration human consciousness.

It is fair to raise the question as to whether the self-centered motivation which this theory predicates is a suitable foundation for the teaching of a religion which has been supposed to rest upon altruism. Can Christian character be secured for the child by leading him through certain experiences which give to him the necessary satisfactions and certain annoyances which will act in a negative way to keep him back from undesirable forms of conduct? If we answer this question in the affirmative, we must concede that there is no possibility of a purely altruistic choice in the child. If even young children begin to do things out of love for other people and without any conscious, sub-conscious, or unconscious reference of their acts to themselves, the Annoyer-Satisfier theory is defective. For if there is any possibility of a purely altruistic choice, the very nature of the Christian religion indicates that religious nurture has in that possibility its opportunity and its chief field of operation.

If a man is capable of altruistic choice, the use of annoyers and satisfiers is of only minor im-

portance and their use is of diminishing value as you ascend the scale of life and conduct. The theory that annoyers and satisfiers control conduct works remarkably well in the training of the lower animals. All wild-animal trainers make large use of it. In the case of young children it works quite well, but its use becomes more and more questionable with advancing age. A desire to secure satisfactions for himself and a desire to escape personal annoyances never made a man a martyr for a great and worthy cause.

The Annoyer-Satisfier theory runs counter to human experience in its highest ranges. The highest satisfactions of man do not come to him who sets these experiences as his goal and who strives to attain them. They come as a sort of glad surprise to the man who forgets self in noble devotion to some worthy cause or in self-effacing love and devotion to his fellow men. Altruism is not sublimated and unconscious egoism. The little child who does for the love of mother or teacher that which he would not otherwise do, is not acting with his own satisfactions in view; if he is so acting, he is not actuated by love.

ALTRUISTIC IDEALS AS THE HIGHEST MOTIVE OF HUMAN CONDUCT

The preceding discussions have indicated that in the highest types of conduct self-interest has no place. If this is a correct conclusion, we must believe that "annoyers" and "satisfiers" will fall short

as incentives for a worthily motivated life. They doubtless have some value in teaching, even in the teaching of religion, but they can have no such universal sway as some believe them to have, and no safe system of religious education can be built on such a mistaken theory of life and conduct. The very genius of the Christian religion would be violated by such a program.

Religious idealists believe that altruistic ideals, not self-centered "satisfiers," offer the highest motives for purposive choice. They believe that love is not in any sense self-seeking and that love is the very essence of the Christian religion. No man ever really loved if his motive was self-satisfaction.

Are the Highest and Most Worthy Motives of Life Secretly Self-Centered, or Are They Essentially Self-Forgetful and Self-Sacrificing? The issue between the religious idealists and the "satisfier psychologists" is so important that we must examine it a little more closely. The religious idealist says that the highest motives of life are inherently self-forgetful and self-sacrificing.

The "satisfier psychologist" says that the highest motives of life are in the last analysis selfish, that they are connected with an inherent tendency to secure satisfactions and to avoid annoyances.

The principle we are considering is operative elsewhere than in religious matters. Perhaps a glance at the way it works in these other spheres may be helpful. Altruism enters into the higher manifestations of patriotism. Must we believe that every hero who has died for his country was really pur-

suing his own satisfactions, or perhaps fleeing from some threatening annoyance? How is it with parenthood? Must we believe that there was never a mother who loved her babe genuinely, that she was in truth deceived in the matter, thinking herself unselfishly devoted to her child, but in reality devoted to a pursuit of the satisfactions the child was capable of offering?[1] Was there never a teacher who lost sight of self in her devotion to her pupils; never a minister who was not secretly seeking his own gratification in all that he did as the leader of a church? Was the sensual worldling right when he sneeringly remarked that the missionary was only seeking self-satisfaction when he went into foreign lands and was therefore not entitled to any credit for what he did?

In the Development of a Religiously Motivated Life, Altruistic Ideals Must Gain a Progressive Ascendancy Over Selfish Interests. Whether the highest and most altruistic motives are genetically related to the more primitive instincts and reactions of the organism as the biological psychologists so strongly insist, is after all not a very important problem for religious education. What we need to keep in mind as religious teachers is the fact that these lower incentives, these satisfactions and annoyances of the organism, must be replaced by higher motives. Man does not live by bread alone.

[1] A recent writer has boldly declared that a mother loves her child because in the end it pays to love it. He goes on to say that if it did not pay for the mother to love her child she would cease to love it. (See "The Teaching of Ideals," by Charters, page 133.) It is remarkable what statements men will make when the afflatus of the annoyer-satisfier theory is upon them.

He is a spiritual being and he must more and more find his standards of conduct in the realm of ideals.

We must likewise remember that these higher motives often come into conflict with lower motives. The demands of the self-centered satisfactions must be denied and the right-of-way given to the other-regarding instincts. Our forefathers had something very real in mind when they spoke of the warfare between the flesh and the spirit. They spoke out of their personal experience and out of the experience of the race. It is not through any coddling of the self-centered interests that higher motives can be reached. It is through their denial and their elimination.

Finding the Ideal Self Through Complete Unselfishness. The way of unselfishness has its rewards. He who loses himself in unselfish devotion to others finds his true self. The finding of this higher self, however, is never the goal of the man who attains it. It is reached through a self-forgetting devotion to that which is not the self. It comes as a surprise to him who attains it.

Perhaps enough has been said to make clear the difference between these two modes of motivating conduct. If far down in the beginning of the individual's consciousness they are near akin, they grow farther and farther apart as the character of the individual develops. Early in the life of the child other than selfish motives begin to appear. It is the business of the religious educator to find and nurture these unselfish instincts rather than to appeal to the child's essentially selfish reactions, to per-

sonal satisfactions and personal annoyances. These nascent and unselfish motives are the opening doors to paths which lead to the truly religious life; the educator who passes them by will start his pupils wrong, they will never arrive at the highest levels of Christian conduct.

THE MOTIVATION OF CONDUCT IN THE PEDAGOGY OF JESUS

That Jesus was concerned with this problem of properly motivated conduct is evident in the gospel narratives. He recognized that the important element in conduct is not the overt act, but the motives which lie back of it. The dominant religions of that day demanded outward conformities. Jesus demanded inward righteousness. He condemned the attitudes which breed injustice and lust. He demanded love, teachableness, and compassion. Since he so strongly stressed the importance of motives in conduct, he must have had the development of right motives as one of his chief objectives. His program of education sustains this inference. How, then, did Jesus seek to develop right motives in his pupils?

Jesus Taught the Truth About Rewards and Punishments. Jesus pointed out the results which follow wrong choice. He spoke of the darkness and stumbling which overtake those who close their eyes to the light. He spoke of those who lose their lives through selfish efforts to save their lives. Jesus likewise pointed out the rewards of right choices. He

said that even the kindly gift of a cup of water would receive its reward. He said that "he that reapeth receiveth wages and gathereth fruit unto eternal life." We may say that Jesus recognized the fact that right choices bring satisfactions and wrong choices annoyances.

Jesus talked with his disciples about the rewards of the religious life. One day Peter asked him what they were to receive since they had left all to follow him. Jesus told them of the friendships and the material rewards which usually result from right living. He told them of the eternal life in a world to come for which the present life is a preparation when it is lived righteously. But he added the statement that these rewards would be received along with "persecutions." These words, however, were spoken by Jesus when the disciples were already his followers. He was explaining to them what the results of their choice were likely to be, not urging them to make a choice by pointing out its satisfying rewards. Indeed, Jesus told his disciples plainly that he who seeks his own life loses it, and we can hardly imagine him appealing to that which was essentially selfish in his pupils to lead them to right choices. He taught the plain truth about rewards and punishments, but he does not seem to have made much use of them as incentives. If he used them thus at all, it was probably due to the fact that his hearers were unresponsive to any other appeal.

Jesus Sought the Motivation of Conduct Through Altruistic Ideals. Jesus taught service as the royal

law of the kingdom. He taught his disciples to visualize a kingdom of God on earth and to pray for its coming. The current conceptions concerning the coming kingdom were egoistic and this was the conception of the disciples for a long time. They thought of the kingdom in terms of official honors for themselves and of national supremacy for their country. Slowly but surely Jesus taught them to think of the kingdom in altruistic terms.

Jesus taught his disciples that they should love one another, but he went far beyond this precept. He said to them, "Love your enemies and do good to them that hate you." He bade them turn the other cheek to the smiter. Forgiveness was not to be limited to the third offense nor to the seventh, but it was to extend to the seventy times seventh offense. Jesus did, indeed, say that through the kind of conduct he was commending the disciples would become children of the Father in heaven. He told them the truth, but did he offer them this outcome as a reward? Did he bid them love one another for the benefit they would thereby receive? Did he bid them love their enemies with a view to securing something of great value for themselves? We cannot answer these questions in the affirmative because of the fact that there is no selfishness in love.

DOMINANT MOTIVES IN THE LIFE OF JESUS

Not only the words of Jesus, but the events of his life have a bearing on our problem. The gospel writers have given us accounts of Jesus in many dif-

ferent situations. They tell us what he did under various circumstances. We can see for ourselves the choices which he made and his motives are not hard to discover. His was the perfect life. What motives prompted him to live as he did?

Was Jesus Influenced by Personal Annoyances and Personal Satisfactions? Let us face the question squarely. Was the perfect life of Jesus the result of choices founded on any sort of effort, conscious or unconscious, to secure satisfactions and to avoid annoyances? The Wilderness temptation yields evidences along this line and they are all against the supposition that Jesus was influenced by these things. Each of the three temptations was an appeal for actions looking toward personal satisfactions. Jesus refused them all. Jesus chose Matthew the publican to be a disciple. Did any consideration of his own satisfactions enter into this choice of Jesus? Did he not know that such a choice would alienate the Jewish leaders and make the cross more certain? Did he not rather choose Matthew for Matthew's sake, because this one lost sheep was precious in the eyes of God? Perhaps we need not pursue this investigation further. The thought of Jesus making choices with his own enjoyment and his personal comfort in view is so out of harmony with the character of the Christ that we hardly need to say anything further concerning it, save to add this closing statement, namely, that we who are his professed followers are to be like him.

Alone in the Garden Seeking to Know the Will of God. We were about to drop the discussion of

this problem, in so far as Jesus is personally concerned, but perhaps we had better see it through. For the professed follower of Jesus the point we are considering is one of basic importance. If Jesus was actuated by a desire to secure personal satisfactions and to escape personal annoyances we wish to know it. If he was not at all influenced by these desires we wish to know that.

An unalterable and loving loyalty to God as the Father in heaven is manifest in every act and word of Jesus. He was thus when he stood in the midst of the doctors in the temple as a boy of twelve. He was thus unto the end. Who can read the account of his last days on earth and believe that there was anything selfish in his love of the Father? In the Garden of Gethsemane, an awful uncertainty seems to have been creeping over the soul of Jesus. He was "sore amazed" not by the certainty of approaching death, but by some mysterious spiritual burden, too vast for our finite minds to understand. The consciousness of God's presence seems to have been obscured. He was face to face with a decision which must be his, and his alone. He agonized to know the Father's will, but he was loyal to the will which he could not then discover.

The Spiritual Agony on the Cross. The Atonement is an Infinite God's way of human redemption and our finite minds will never be able to comprehend it, but we can apprehend something of its significance. If the consciousness of God's approval seems to be obscured for Jesus in the Garden, on the cross it seems altogether removed. How else shall

we interpret the awful cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Could Jesus yield to the Father perfect obedience and perfect trust when all sustaining satisfactions of God's approval were removed? It looks as though Jesus met this test triumphantly on Calvary. When all foundations were removed, all satisfactions absent for the present and unassured for the future, he was wholly true. "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

CHAPTER XII

The Ultimate Sources of Altruistic Ideals: Are They Found in Social Relationships or in Mystical Religious Experience?

If altruistic ideals are supremely important in a religiously motivated life, the building of these ideals is one of the chief tasks of religious education. The teacher of religion must know how to help his pupils to attain high ideals. She must know how these ideals originate and how they grow, if she is to nurture them in the lives of her pupils. The teacher's understanding of the ideal-building process in the individual will be in harmony with her conceptions as to how ideals have found a place in the life of the race. There are two different theories as to how ideals have been developed in the human race. There are those who believe that ideals have a narrowly naturalistic origin, that even religious ideals have grown up entirely through man's ordinary experiences, chiefly his social experiences. On the other hand there are those who recognize the importance of social experiences in the creation of religious ideals but who believe that there is a mystical reality in religious experience which cannot be explained in terms of human contacts. The matter at issue between these two

schools of thought is of weighty importance in religious education and it must now receive our attention.

THE SOCIAL THEORY CONCERNING THE ORIGIN OF ALTRUISTIC IDEALS

Darwin included in his conception of "the struggle for existence" a "struggle for the life of others." Scientists like Drummond and Thomson have shown that a profound altruism and coöperation is found in the world of animal nature. Care for offspring appears far down in the scale of animal life and it often manifests itself in self-sacrificing devotion. Even that part of animate nature which is ruled almost wholly by instinct, is full of potent altruistic tendencies. Bees and wasps and ants wear out their lives in a toil for offspring which they, in many cases, never see, and which are not usually their own, but belong to the social structure of which they are members. Birds are so devoted to their young that they forget to feed themselves when their young ones are clamorous for food. In the higher forms of animal life, care for offspring broadens out into a care for the herd. "Women and children first" is the law of the sea and it is the law of the musk oxen on the bleak Arctic tundra. When the herd is attacked by wolves the calves are placed in the center of a circle, beyond the calves stand the cows facing the foe, while the outermost line of defense is held by the adult males.

Many birds and animals show a remarkable con-

jugal devotion. The little Bearded Titmouse of Europe spreads his wing over his mate to shield her from the sleet and the wintry wind. The Canada goose may live a hundred years after losing his mate, but he never takes another. Even the timid and sweet-voiced Brown Thrasher will fight to the death with a blacksnake when he is defending his nest and his mate.

It is in connection with this altruistic tendency that birds and lower animals show something near akin to moral courage. Under its inspiration birds burst forth in song. Coming into full bloom in man it is connected with that which is most beautiful in art, that which runs through our greatest literary productions, that which underlies our civilization.

Is that crowning altruism which bourgeons forth in the religious man at his best only the climax, the evolutionary development, of the tendencies which we can trace upward from the lowest forms of animal life? So the adherents of the social theory of altruism believe. They maintain that religious altruism is the direct and historical descendant of that pre-human altruism which may be traced in bees and birds; and that it has no other origin. The higher has evolved from the lower, without any specific change in natural processes and without any interruption of their continuity.

It may be added that certain psychologists are more ready to admit the all-sufficiency of the social theory concerning altruism, than is the case with some of our greatest scientists. When Charles Dar-

win felt that organic evolution and natural selection fell short of a full explanation for all the phenomena of life, he spoke of "an inspiration of genius" which he conceived as coming in to complete the evolutionary process. He made no attempt to analyze this agency, or to follow his suggestions concerning it to their logical conclusions. He did, however, recognize the need for some such hypothesis. He felt his other explanations to be inadequate without it. To admit the possibility of such an agency in the development of man, it to part company with a narrow Naturalism. If Darwin's suggestion may perchance be true, we have every reason to believe that altruism and religion have developed through other agencies and in answer to higher sanctions than any which appear in organic evolution.

Some Results of the Social Theory Concerning the Genesis of Religion. To decide the problem we are considering without any consideration concerning the influence of the Social Theory on the world of morals and religion would be a foolish procedure. Our problem is not primarily biological and we must take into consideration other than biological data if our conclusions are to be well-founded. What significance has this theory for religion in general and for Christianity in particular?

Under this theory, the thought of any mystical and distinctly spiritual revelation of God is of course excluded. Those who have given assent to the theory are forced to conclude that our ideas of God are constructs built up by purely human rela-

tionships. He is a projection of our social experiences, a personification of that which we find most desirable in our contacts with our fellowmen.

As God becomes a projection of social relationships under this theory, so prayer becomes nothing more than earnest social desire; worship becomes personal and social self-realization. Religion thus becomes identical with morality.

To make these suggested changes in our conceptions concerning the fundamentals of religion is no light matter. We may well make inquiry as to whether religion thus pauperized by the elimination of a personal God and the dissolution of our conceptions concerning prayer, will have any power to inspire and potentialize the life of to-day.

Bearing of this Theory on the Personality and Work of Jesus. For the Christian there is another inquiry of utmost importance which must be made concerning this theory: what are its effects on our conceptions concerning the Founder of our faith? A thorough-going evolutionism such as Darwin never dared formulate, but concerning which some pupils of Darwin have shown more courage than their teacher, makes of Jesus only one link in the developmental process. It makes him dependent upon that which was inherent in organic life from its beginning. Since he appeared nineteen centuries ago, it suggests the conclusion that many of his precepts have long since been out-grown; for it necessarily conceives of him as a man of his own times, a link in an on-going process which has evolved higher forms than he could have known.

THE SOCIAL-MYSTICAL THEORY CONCERNING THE ORIGIN OF ALTRUISTIC IDEALS

Over against the theory we have been discussing stands another which we may call the Social-Mystical theory of religion. Those who champion this interpretation of religion utter no sweeping negations concerning the altruism which is manifest almost everywhere in animate nature. They may go so far as to agree that the altruistic ideals of mankind are linked to a long chain of precedent altruisms developed in man's long journey upward from the sod. They do not hold, however, that organic evolution can offer a full explanation of man's altruistic instincts and religious heritage. To the social influences which have shaped the ideals, consciousness, and attitudes of the race, they would add another factor. They believe that mystical religious experience comes in to supplement, crown, and universalize the altruisms which have come into being through what we may call the natural processes, though these mystical religious experiences may themselves be natural in a larger meaning of the term. Supporters of this theory recognize a divine Purpose working within the natural world, but they do not conceive of that Purpose as confined within known and narrow natural laws. They believe that in some way the Infinite comes into immediate contact with the souls of men and that in this contact religion and the higher altruisms are established.

Social Relationships an Aid to Man's Comprehension of the Deity. Those who support the

Social-Mystical theory of religion are ready to grant that human relationships are an aid to man in his efforts to comprehend the nature of the Deity and our relations to him. They do not, however, like the supporters of the other theory which we have been considering, identify social relationships with the idea of God, nor do they conceive of social experiences as identical with the experience of man with his Creator.

Conceiving of our religious heritage as mystical as well as social in its origin, adherents of the Social-Mystical theory of religion look upon the Bible not as a mere history of the social development of the Hebrew people, but upon it as primarily a record of man's mystical experiences with the Deity and man's attempts to interpret and apply what these experiences have meant for the destiny of the race. You can usually distinguish the adherents of the two theories by the difference in their conceptions concerning the Bible. To the one the Bible gives aid only as it helps us to interpret social relationships ancient and modern; to the other it gives aid chiefly because it records a unique and genuine religious experience, a revelation of the Deity to man.

The Social-Mystical Theory and the Personality of Jesus. Perhaps the most serious charge against the purely social interpretation of religion lies in the fact that it removes Jesus from his central place in the Christian religion. No such charge can be laid against the theory we have just been discussing. It is perfectly consistent with the sublime statement of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; "God

having in olden times spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portion and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds." If the course of nature is not a closed and mechanical system, if Darwin was right in conceiving of an "inspiration of genius" breathed into man from above, if prophets and righteous men have felt the presence of God; there is a place for Jesus as a unique and all-important factor in the religious life of the race, as the Son of God through whom we have the revelation of the Father's nature in all its perfection, of love and purity and power.

Between these two theories we must as teachers of little children and youth make a choice. It will not do to waver and halt between the two opinions. Which theory gives a more reasonable explanation of the religious history of the race? Have the religious prophets of mankind been evolved or have they also been inspired? Have they as they rose shining like beacon fires in the night, been forced up by the tragic events of their time, or have they likewise caught a light from above which they have reflected into the faces of mankind? We should not forget the fact that these prophets of the race have uniformly believed that they were in touch with the unseen forces of the Infinite. To their testimony we must add the witness of the millions of humble folk who have experienced in some degree what the prophets have experienced and who have corroborated the testimony of these leaders of

the race. As Christians we will not make choice between these two opinions without weighing with scrupulous care the relationships of each to him who said of himself, "I am the light of the world, he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." It is therefore suitable that we now turn to a study of the life and teaching of Jesus, seeking some final evidence as to which of these theories is true.

WHAT JESUS TAUGHT CONCERNING THE SOURCE OF ALTRUISTIC IDEALS

There was no such thing as a social theory concerning the origin of religious ideals in the days when Jesus lived and taught in Palestine, and therefore he of course said nothing having direct and intentional reference to such a theory. Nevertheless, many of the things he taught and many of the things which he did, have an indirect bearing on our problem. There are certain conclusions which we can draw from these indirect evidences and we can draw them with almost as much confidence as would be the case had Jesus spoken with this problem in view.

Jesus Used Human Relationships to Illustrate Spiritual Truths Concerning the Deity. Some of the parables of Jesus are based on the facts and phenomena of Nature. He drew spiritual lessons from birds and flowers and from the colors in the evening sky. Most of his parables, however, are based on human relationships; a father giving food

to his children, a master and his servants, a king and his subjects, a host and his guests. Jesus chose a family title as the best designation of the Deity. He called God, Father. His most sublime picture of the Deity does not portray God as a king, but as a father who welcomes home his wandering boy with feasting and dancing.

Does the fact that Jesus found in human relationships his best illustrations of God and his relations to men, have any significance for the problems we are considering? In choosing these illustrations did Jesus suggest anything as to the ultimate sources of our ideas concerning the Deity? I do not see how these illustrations of Jesus can be construed as evidences favorable to the social theory concerning the origin of religious ideas. The hearers of Jesus were familiar with home life. They lived in the midst of social customs. In using the relationships of the home and the social customs of the day, Jesus was teaching with skill. He was using the familiar to make plain that which was unfamiliar. He was not delivering a lecture on the origin of religious ideas, but seeking to make those ideas clear and conduct-controlling in the lives of those who heard him. He used social illustrations in the same way that he used illustrations from animal life and illustrations drawn from the phenomena of the inanimate world.

Indeed, the teaching of Jesus and his methods indicate that he did not regard religious ideals as having their origin in social relationships. He said that the things which he spoke were the things

which he had heard from the Father. He taught his disciples to pray and he guided them into mystical experiences, in order that the truths which he taught might become conduct-controlling ideals. The people of our day who believe that our religious ideals have come out of social relationships and from no other source build a program of religious education centering in social activities. The program of Jesus had social regeneration in view but it did not have its center there.

One Who Spoke with Authority. If religion is a product of social evolution it has come out of an on-going process, out of experimentation, and there are no elements of religion which are not subject to constant revision. If religion is purely social in its origins, Pragmatic Philosophy is not only a logical attitude toward religious truth, but the only logical attitude toward it. If religion is nothing but a product of social evolution, there is nothing genuinely authoritative in religion.

But Jesus evidently had an unwavering faith in the finality of the truths he taught. He said that heaven and earth should pass away, but that his words should never pass away. Rejected by the leaders of the nation and with only a handful of irresolute followers, he spoke confidently of the day when his gospel should be preached over all the world. When he preached to the multitudes on the mountain they were amazed because he taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes.

How Jesus Instilled into His Pupils Conduct-Controlling Ideals. Although Jesus has left us no

statement concerning the origin of religious ideals in the race, his methods of teaching indicate pretty clearly what he thought concerning the origin of these ideals in the individual. He took twelve men in whose hearts had been nurtured a prejudice against Gentiles which amounted to race hatred. From eleven of these men these prejudices were eliminated. Most of them became missionaries to Gentile people and most of them died as martyrs that Gentiles might have the light of truth. If any group of men ever achieved conduct-controlling and wholly altruistic ideals, the disciples of Jesus were that group. What was the method of the Teacher who accomplished this transformation?

First of all this Teacher stated the ideal. He made it clear by illustrations and figures of speech; so clear that his pupils could not misunderstand it. He told them to love their enemies and to pray for those who despitefully used them. He tied these ideas of conduct to the religious ideals which his pupils already possessed. He showed them that in obeying these precepts they would be walking in the steps of God who sends his rain on the just and on the unjust, who causes his sun to rise on the evil and on the good. He led the way, for he practiced what he preached. The pupils of Jesus had constant evidences that their Teacher was wholly true to the ideals which he had announced. He set them at tasks the doing of which would help to break down prejudice and set free compassion. Last of all he told them to wait in Jerusalem until they should pass through a religious experience

which would fit them for their sublime task. In some three years the mighty work of preparation was done and the disciples went forth to live in harmony with the ideals which their Teacher taught, to turn the other cheek to the smiter, to pray for those who persecuted them, to lay down their lives for the good of those they had once despised. Ideals clearly stated, reënforced by example, put to the test in practice, linked with a system of religious beliefs, vitalized by the emotions, made supreme by mystical communion with the Infinite; this seems to have been the program of the Great Teacher and concerning its efficiency the history of the past two thousand years bears evidence. In accompanying this great task Jesus made large use of conceptions of the Deity which transcend human social relationships and his supreme trust was in a mystical experience of his pupils with such a Deity. Do not these facts indicate something as to the origin and completion of altruistic ideals in the race?

THE TWO THEORIES AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The preceding paragraphs have led us to a consideration of the respective educational programs which will grow out of the two theories we have been considering. The two theories differ not only as to the origin of religious ideals, but as to the essential nature of religion. One leads to a belief that religion is only morality at its best. The other leads to a conception of religion as an attitude toward a personal God who is the Determiner of

human destiny. When religious educators differ thus in their conceptions as to the essential nature of religion, they differ fundamentally and their differences will manifest themselves in methods used, goals chosen, and standards erected.

How the Two Schools Will Differ in Methods of Teaching. The church school which is built in harmony with the Social Theory concerning the origin of religious ideals will have a program centering in activities of a social nature. It will seek to set up ideals in the individual in the way its leaders conceive ideals to have been introduced to the race. Instruction will be made subordinate to activity. Religious teaching will center in "situations." If the teachers of the school carry out their principles there will be little effort to cultivate a conception of a personal Deity and to develop attitudes toward Him. There will be little effort to develop habits of worship in the usual meaning of that term. How could there be if the teachers think of worship as "personal social self-realization" and not as communion with a personal God who has objective reality and who may be known and experienced immediately.

The church school which is built in harmony with the Social-Mystical Theory will seek to establish clear conceptions of religious truth as a basis for ideals. It will therefore look upon religious instruction as having an importance quite apart from any immediate "situation" which demands personal choice. It will nurture the spirit of worship as a communion with God, a mystical experience which

is of supreme importance in the religious development of the pupil, an experience which may be shared, but which may likewise be an individual experience and which always has certain personal aspects which cannot be explained in terms of social relationships.

How the Two Schools Will Differ in Goals. The two schools will differ in methods because they differ in goals. The school which is founded on the Social Theory will aim to make pupils capable of fitting into their social environment helpfully and happily and constructively. The school which is founded on the Social-Mystical theory will include these desirable social ends in its goal, but it will go beyond them. It will seek to make its pupils fit for the life which now is and for that which is to come. It will seek right social relations, through establishing right relations between the individual and his God rather than by a process which merely seeks the same goal through direct culture of social traits, and leaves the individual's relationships to a personal God out of account.

How the Two Schools Will Differ in Their Standards. Differing in their goals and in their methods, the two schools will differ in the standards and measurements they establish. In the school built on the Social Theory a teacher will be rated by her ability to develop her pupils socially. The standards of the other school will be broader and higher. The teacher in the school founded on the Social-Mystical Theory will be rated on her ability to develop the social capacities of her pupils, but

also on her ability to nurture them in the understanding of religious truth and in mystical religious experience.

The two schools will likewise set up different standards and measurements for their curriculum materials. The school founded on the Social Theory will have a wide conception as to the nature of the curriculum, including within that term not only literary material, but the whole range of pupil experience and pupil activities. The school of the other type will probably be constructed on an equally wide conception of the curriculum, but it will make more of Biblical material than the other, since the theory on which this school is built has a place for the Bible as a unique book, a record of a divine relation which culminated in the coming of Jesus as the world's great religious Teacher. In the school founded on the Social-Mystical theory, measurements and standards will be determined largely by the life and teachings of Jesus. The school founded on the Social theory will not be able to place the Founder of the Christian faith in this central and determining position because its fundamental presuppositions have already displaced him from any such position.

CHAPTER XIII

Mystical Religious Experience: Is It Due to Misinterpretation of Subjective Data or to Spiritual Contact with the Deity as an Objective Reality?

If altruistic ideals are of fundamental importance to the religiously motivated life and if, in the ultimate analysis, these ideals are established through mystical religious experience, mysticism in the sense of personal experience with the Deity becomes wholly essential to religion. Religion as we have heretofore understood it stands or falls with the reality of mystical religious experience. Without mystical religious experience, we may still have morality of a man-made kind, we may still have sociability, but not religion as mankind has conceived it from beyond the dawn of history. Religion has to do with man's experiences with a Determiner of Destiny and in all the higher religions this Determiner of Destiny is a Person and a Unity.

We have already noted some facts concerning the place of mystical religious experience in the life of the individual but the matter is one of such basic importance that we must turn to it again in this chapter in order that we may search out more fully its significance and its indispensability to any valid conception concerning what constitutes the religious

life. There are two opposing theories as to the nature of those experiences which have been termed mystical. These theories we must now consider in order that we may determine which seems more reasonable and decide as to which gives the better explanation of the facts of experience.

THE SUBJECTIVE MISINTERPRETATION THEORY

There are those who maintain that what has been called mystical religious experience is due solely to man's misinterpretation of his own bodily and mental processes. His body or his mind acts in some fashion unfamiliar to him and therefore in a way mysterious to him. Some automatic and unexpected action of the body occurs and primitive man explains the phenomenon as due to "possession" by a spirit not his own. His mind acts in an unfamiliar way under some unusual nervous stress or under the influence of drugs, and primitive man feels that these results are brought about by a power not his own which has somehow found lodgment within his body and mind.

This subjective misinterpretation of the data of consciousness, say some of our modern psychologists, is the ultimate explanation of primitive man's belief in spirit possession and likewise the explanation of all mystical religious experience. The inspiration of the Hebrew Prophets and a Christian's sense of the reality of prayer are, like the shamanism of the savage, due to no objective reality but to a misinterpretation of subjective data which seem mys-

terious because their real nature and origin are not understood.

Dr. Coe's Statement of the Subjective Misinterpretation Theory. What has been said in the preceding paragraph has such serious significance for religion that it ought not to be expressed without corroborating testimony. Perhaps Doctor Coe has expressed this theory as clearly and withal as boldly as any man of our day. Let us see what he has to say concerning mystical religious experience.

On page 264 of his "Psychology of Religion" Coe says, "When primitive man experienced loss of control through drug intoxication or through any of the trance-inducing processes already described as the basis of shamanism, the only possible interpretation was 'possession,' that somebody else was controlling the muscles and even the thoughts." So much for the mystical experience of primitive man. Doctor Coe goes on to say, "From spiritism, whether primitive or modern, to what the various religions have called inspirations, there is entire continuity in point of physical process, and even in historical development; . . . if the term 'inspiration' points to process as distinguished from content, then inspiration is common to spiritism and to prophetism. More than this: it exists in Christian churches today as a sense of guidance or of illumination, as assurance or witness of the Spirit, and as a sense of the Presence of God or Christ." (Pages 265 and 266.)

This seems plains enough. Doctor Coe believes that the savage man's belief in spirit possession is

due to misinterpretation of his own bodily and mental states and to no objective spiritual and personal reality such as he imagines. He likewise believes that the Christian's sense of divine guidance, his sense of divine assurance and approval, his consciousness of the presence of God, all rest on the same foundations as the spiritism of primitive man and that this foundation is nothing but man's own automatisms made mysterious by their being hidden from the understanding of the deluded worshiper.

Some Remarks Concerning Doctor Coe's Explanation of Mystical Religious Experience. It is no unkindness to say that Doctor Coe is confessedly discussing something of which he has no first-hand knowledge. In the preface of his book he says, "My religious experience has been as free from mysticism as it has been from dogmatism." Since he has in a preceding paragraph claimed to be free from dogmatic attitudes he evidently intends us to understand that he has never undergone any religious experience which may be considered mystical. He is therefore discussing something concerning which he has only second-hand information. His conclusions concerning the reality of mystical religious experience must be considered in the light of the testimony of persons who believe they have passed through such experiences. It should likewise be kept in mind that this latter company are a great multitude, not only the outstanding mystics of history but the millions of more ordinary folk who have lived and died with an unshaken faith in the reality of their fellowship with God as an objective reality.

Doctor Coe's argument is not inductive, but deductive. He begins with the bald assertion that primitive man's belief in a world of spiritual beings is due solely to his misinterpretation of his own mental and physical states brought on by drugs or other means. He follows with an equally bald assertion that there is nothing in any sort of mystical religious experience which is not due to these same causes. To begin with these assumptions is to start with what he expects to prove. What grounds has he for denying that even the mystical experience of primitive man may be due to some dim apprehension of some great spiritual Reality which lies back of all and over all? Apparently he has no grounds for his denial of this explanation save his own unbelief in its possibility. What grounds has he for asserting that the utterances of the Hebrew prophets are one in origin with the utterances of the shaman? He gives too little weight to the difference in content between the two. The shaman utters words which may be disproved the day he utters them; the precepts of the prophets have rung true through thousands of years. Moreover, what shall we do with Jesus? He was a prophet. He spoke out of the consciousness of a constant fellowship with God. What will Doctor Coe say of him?

It would seem that Doctor Coe has relied too exclusively on the intellectual content of mystical religious experience in his efforts to disprove its objective reality. He says that the Christian comes from his mystical experience a Christian still and that the Mohammedan comes from his mystical

religious experience a Mohammedan still. The beliefs of the Christian as to Christ and God have not been changed, neither have the beliefs of the Mohammedan been changed as to Mohammed and Allah. Mystical religious experience would be a potent factor in life and conduct if it were wholly devoid of informational significance. In stirring the emotions and invigorating the will it would still be of profound significance, but we are by no means justified in concluding with Dr. Coe that such experience is devoid of intellectual influence. If we may credit the New Testament narrative we must believe that a certain mystical experience of Saul of Tarsus on the Damascus road had no small result in his intellectual life. Who shall say, moreover, what part mystical religious experience has played in the lives of the millions who have turned from paganism to become followers of the Christ? Conversion in such cases is in part a choice made possible by a new illumination and this illumination of the intellect is evidently a fruit of mystical religious experience.

Is Mystical Religious Experience Necessarily Immediate? The question as to the reality of mystical religious experience has often been confused with the question of its immediacy. There has been an assumption that if mystical religious experience is not immediate it is not connected with objective reality as a causative agency. It would seem that Doctor Coe's thinking is influenced by this assumption. He nowhere admits any objective reality back of mystical religious experience. To him the

reality is imagined, a result of the misinterpretation of the data of experience. But he does make one exception. This exception he names "Social immediacy." In this connection he says, "With the growth of intense devotion to the neighbor whom we have seen—one's own devotion, and the devotion of others—it becomes easier and easier to believe in God. Jesus' life of simple unreserved neighborly love does, in truth, directly beget faith in a loving God, and this is the tendency of every similar life. Thus in and through the choice of others' good as our own, which may also be called the identification of our will with theirs, the real existence of a common will, and even the personality of it, become convictions." (Page 262.)

It would seem to me that here Doctor Coe admits the mystical reality of religious experience. That "real existence" and "personality" with which we establish relations through the medium of social service and the love of our fellowmen is God. But God is not to be identified with the medium; our experience with him is made possible through the medium, but that experience has a reality of its own quite apart from the instrument which enables us to enter into it. A powerful telescope enables me to see a star I could never otherwise see. I see the star through the medium of the telescope and yet I have a real experience of the star which is not definable in any terms of my experiences with the instrument through which my experience of the star is made possible. Even so we may have mystical experiences of God through the medium of social re-

lationships. In the faces of our beloved we may behold the Eternal.

What Doctor Coe has said concerning social relationships is quite true of other relationships as well. If man can find God through his fellowship with his fellowmen, may he not find him as a real existence and a personality in his relationships to the natural world? If one man says that he finds God as a reality and personality in the blending of his will with the will of his neighbor, shall we say that another man is laboring under a delusion if he says he finds God in a vision across a sunlit sea, or hears him in the rustling grass?

Thus from many different sources it is possible for us to build up not merely a firm conviction concerning the reality of God and his personality, but a growing experience with him, for even though our experience with him be mediated it is none the less real. Doctor Coe rightly suggests the life of Jesus as one of the ways to find faith in God. Moreover, to believe in God is to have experience with him, for a genuine faith in him would seem to presuppose some experience of him as a reality.

What has been said must not be construed as evidence that mythical religious experience is never immediate. If man can experience God as a reality through social relationships as Doctor Coe suggests there is no reason why having discovered God he should not have direct experience with him without the aid of any mediating instrument. In fact there is no hard and fast line of demarcation between experience which is mediated and that which is im-

mediate. I may have experience with another person through a book which he has written, or in a conversation over the telephone, or in sharing a common task, or in the intimate relationships of the home. In all of these experiences with the other person there is more or less mediation, the book, the sound of his voice, the sight of him at work by my side, the contacts of intimate fellowship in the home. In all these experiences I never experienced the man himself except through something connected with him. But my experience of him may become more and more immediate, until the mediating agency may well-nigh disappear. There seem to be well established instances of immediate transfer of thought from one individual to another. Those who are most competent to judge are convinced that there is such a thing as telepathy. If men's experiences with one another thus verge toward immediacy it is not unreasonable to believe that man may have immediate experience with his Creator.

THE OBJECTIVE REALITY THEORY

What has been said in the preceding paragraphs is very largely a defense of what may be called the Objective Reality Theory of Mystical religious experience. As has been suggested this theory maintains that mystical religious experience is based on a spiritual contact with the Deity as an objective reality. This experience may be immediate or it may be attained through the mediation of such agencies as human social relationships, contacts with

the natural world, or a contemplation of the facts of history.

Mystical Religious Experience Not Necessarily Ecstatic. It seems to me that Doctor Coe and others of his school err in confining mystical religious experience chiefly to that state of consciousness wherein a person is nearly or quite beside himself through the influence of drugs or artificially stimulated nervous reactions. Thus defined mystical religious experience is the more easily dismissed as automatisms, self-hypnotism and such like; but as a matter of fact, religious experience in its highest forms and in its most mystical aspects is quite the opposite of the experiences which have been suggested. The mind of a drunken man appears to be a jumble of ideas without clear distinctions of meanings and largely devoid of the rational control necessary for concentration. This is not at all the mental state of one who has mystical religious experiences. A person who feels the presence of God in prayer has set his mental life in order. He has put aside the meaningless drift of idle thought and centered his attention on God. His experience is clear, meaningful, never to be forgotten. What likeness to this high spiritual state can be found in the maudlin confusion of images within the drunkard's mind; mental experiences which he forgets the moment he becomes sober? We are all aware that the drunkard suffers from hallucinations, that he sometimes believes for the time being in the objective reality of things which exist only within his own mind, but what reasons have we for identifying

this pitiable state of the inebriate with the highest religious experiences of a devout and reverent soul bowed before the Eternal God?

Mystical Religious Experiences Confined Not to Personal Automatisms. Doctor Coe traces the mystical experiences of primitive man back to certain bodily and mental experiences which seemed mysterious to primitive man. He overlooks the fact that by no means all of primitive man's mystical experiences arise from unexplained phenomena within his own mind or body. The same kind of conceptions arise out of his contemplation of the natural world as arise out of his contemplation of his own inner experiences. He peoples all nature with spirits. Who shall say that he is not fundamentally right in conceiving of a spiritual background for all that is?

At all events, we cannot logically contend that the mysticism of primitive man arose within the narrow limits to which Doctor Coe refers it. Nor can we logically argue from these narrow and uncertain premises that all religious mysticism is devoid of reality.

Is it not reasonable to believe that while primitive man made many blunders, referring to mystical and objective reality some experiences which had no such origin, there was nevertheless something in his experience which justified him in believing in the objective reality of a spiritual world which was not himself though he was akin to it and linked to it? Must we believe that this blunder of primitive man has grown and spread and tightened its hold

so that it persists to-day in the lives of millions of people, people who are not feeble-minded enthusiasts but who are withal the hope of humanity? Do blunders of judgment made by people of low intelligence have a power of thus establishing themselves among people of marked intelligence and a way of growing from century to century?

Functional Value and Objective Reality. After his negative conclusions as to the reality of mystical religious experience, Doctor Coe takes up the matter from the functional point of view. He concedes a considerable measure of value to mysticism. It may help to focalize attention on some social idea or standard, he says, and he likewise thinks it has value in overcoming such defects as a divided personality. He suggests that discovery may be one of the functions of mysticism.

This is no large catalogue of benefits and not many mystics would be satisfied with its severe limitations, but we may well raise the question as to whether even these limited benefits could uniformly result from a false belief, a misconception, a delusive fancy devoid of any essential element of reality. If the mystical religious experience has no basis in objective reality, we should expect only meager and temporary benefits from it and we should expect its bad effects to far outweigh any benefits it might offer. Such are the usual results from false beliefs. There is far too much thoughtless separation of function and reality in our day as though they had no sort of relation to one another.

If mystical religious experience has no objective

reality, it is an illusion and ought to conform to what we have found to be true concerning illusions. Now we know that illusions do not usually persist for any length of time in a normal mind. If they refer to matters which have little to do with every-day experience they persist for a longer period than is the case when they have to do with matters which are constantly recurring in the experience of the individual. Experience reveals the nature of the illusion and disillusionment follows, except in the case of people suffering from mental derangement. If mystical religious experience had no objective reality, it would be impossible for a normal person to believe in it for any extended period of time. It would suffer continually from the controverting experiences of life. If a belief in the reality of man's fellowship with God is a false belief, what a strange phenomena is presented by the aged Jacob leaning on his staff and saying, "The God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God who hath fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel who hath redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." Will a normal man pursue an illusion all his life and hand it on as his best gift to his children, if it daily mocks him for his faith and fills his life with a thousand disappointments?

If there is no mystical reality in religion, Jesus is only a figure of history, and any belief we may cherish concerning a spiritual fellowship with him is an empty fancy. Unbelievers have of course the right to make answer that it is even so, but before they put forth their conclusions as established facts

of science, they should at least offer some plausible explanation of such a man as old Polycarp of Smyrna. When urged to deny the Christ, Polycarp answered, "Eighty and six years I have served him and he has done me nothing but good. How could I deny him, my Saviour and my Lord?" He spoke these words with the flaming fagots for his burning already in view. Do men follow an illusion for eighty-six years and then die rather than deny its truth? Did Polycarp die for something which had no reality and no value save the meager and transient "functional" value of a false belief?

Mystical Reality an Element of All Religions. In seeking to disprove the mystical reality of religious experience, modern psychologists are striking at the foundations not only of Christianity but at the foundations of all the religions that exist or ever have existed. All types of religious belief rest on a faith in man's relationships to unseen, but real spiritual forces which are not his own. We may have a system of ethical standards without a belief in the mystical reality of religion, it is true. Some insist on calling such a system of ethical standards a religion, but in doing this they use the term *religion* in a sense in which it has not heretofore been used.

The Mysticism of India and the Mysticism of Jesus. Doctor Coe seems to think of mystical religious experience as essentially unsocial. He seems to think that Indian mysticism has a large place in Christian mysticism. That Indian mysticism is essentially unsocial is evident from its fruit in coun-

tries where Brahmanism and Buddhism have held sway. It is likewise probable that Indian mysticism influenced Christian mystics especially during that period of church history when asceticism was in the ascendancy. But any identification of the Christian's belief in God as an objective reality with Indian mysticism is certainly erroneous. What has Indian mysticism to do with the Christian's belief that he has communion with God as an objective reality? The Hebrews believed this. All religions have conceived of it in a more or less definite manner. Why trace it back to India? The mystical quality of the Christian religion cannot be logically discredited by referring its genesis to Indian mysticism.

Mysticism in the Life and in the Pedagogy of Jesus. In preceding chapters we have referred to the mystical experience of Jesus and to the fact that he made such experiences for his disciples a part of that program through which he prepared them for their great task. If we deny the mystical reality of religion we must believe that Jesus was mistaken in believing himself in communion with God. We must conclude that he too was misinterpreting his own bodily and mental states, thinking of them as due to the touch of God, when they had no such source of causation. We must believe that he was either mistaken or seeking to deceive his disciples when he taught them about the reality of God's relationships to them and the possibilities of fellowship with the Father through himself as the Son of God.

To Abandon Belief in the Mystical Reality of Religion Means the Dissolution of the Christian Faith. We might point out the significance of the matter we are considering for religious education. But what is the use? Its significance extends beyond the teaching of the Christian religion to the Christian religion itself. If there is no mystical reality in religion there can hardly be said to be any such thing as religion, certainly no such thing as the Christian religion. If we must abandon this essential of our faith, our first task is not the consideration of the means and methods of religious education, but the consideration of means and methods for building a religion to take the place of that which we have discarded. In the task which we have thus made necessary we may bring forth something which we may call by the name of religion, but it will not be such. There is no religion without a God who may be known as an objective reality. Sociability is a God-given goal, but it is not God. He who worships it is an idolater.

CHAPTER XIV

The Nature of Religious Education: Is the Religious Educative Process Limited to Definite Decisions Made in the Presence of Concrete Situations? or Has the Whole Range of Experience Educational Value?

We have been discussing matters of such basic importance to religious education that it may be well to restate our findings at the beginning of this chapter. A review of the conclusions heretofore reached will likewise serve as a way of approach to the study of the problem suggested in the theme of the present chapter. Our study of the teachings of Jesus and of the methods which he used has led to certain conclusions three of which seem to be of peculiar importance. In the first place, there seems to be no possible doubt concerning the opinion of Jesus as to the essential nature of man and the ultimate sources of human conduct. He did not regard man as a mere mechanism. He built his program of education on the belief that man has power of purposive choice. In the second place Jesus evidently sought to build altruistic ideals rather than to develop an instinct of the organism which manifests itself in a tendency to avoid annoyances and to seek satisfactions. He set before

his pupils character traits which were both personal and social and sought to make of these traits ideals through developing in his pupils clear conceptions as to their meaning and worth and an abiding desire for their attainment. In the third place, Jesus, in both his teaching and his methods, indicates an abiding confidence that these conduct-controlling and other-regarding ideals are to be established not merely through human relationships, but through mystical religious experiences based on reality.

The Problem Stated. The problem which we are about to consider, in a way, takes for granted man's power of purposive choice. As to the nature and limitations of that power there are differences of opinion which follow rather closely differences in attitude toward the problem which is to be considered in this chapter. Concerning these differences of opinion more must be said a little farther along in our discussion. Our problem, then, has to do not primarily with the reality of purposive choice, but with the place of purposive choice in the educative process. Do definite decisions made in the presence of concrete situations have educational value? If so, how great is their value? Is it of so much worth that all other educative influences may not be compared to it? Is the way of definite decisions in the presence of concrete situations the only way in which an individual can be educated?

The foregoing questions are answered by different people in widely different ways. There is a traditional system of religious pedagogy which makes little use of purposive choice as an educational

agency. On the other hand there has grown up a Situationist School which comes near to making such choices the only element in the religious development of the individual. In this connection Professor Bower has said, "The question is sharply raised whether it is possible to teach morality and religion apart from the actual situations in which one is called upon to live his life morally and religiously. From the point of view of the present discussion the answer is an emphatic negative. If morality and religion are to be taught effectively, that is, so that they will function in the conscious and purposive directions of experience from within, they must be taught as an integral part of the responses that are made to day-by-day actual, concrete, and typical situations that life presents to the learner, with the relations, functions, and responsibilities that they involve." [1] Having indicated the extreme views concerning the importance of purposive choice as an element in the educative process, we must now examine these views somewhat more in detail. Two solutions of the same problem which are so widely different cannot both be right. It is important that religious teachers discover which of these solutions has on its side the larger measure of truth.

A Solution Which Denies or Largely Ignores the Educational Value of Purposive Choice. There are probably few religious teachers who would deny the educational value of purposive choice if they were brought face to face with the problem con-

[1] Bower: "The Curriculum of Religious Education," page 55.

cerning its value. There are many religious teachers, however, who make comparatively little use of purposive choice as a factor in religious education. They have not thought of it as an educational agency, or as a step in the educative process, but as a result of that process. Teachers of this type are apt to carry on an educational program which is practically nothing but more or less successful attempts to impart information. Some of the more progressive teachers of this group secure effective training in worship. But where this type of teaching prevails there is no definite program of activities which is coextensive with the informational program and inherently related to it. The goal of such teachers is the religious development of the pupil, primarily through a knowledge of the scriptures.

Let us examine this solution of the problem in the light of the pedagogy of Jesus. Even a superficial examination of the teaching methods of Jesus would seem to indicate that he sought to impart information, to instill right ideas in the minds of his pupils, to guide them through those mental labors whereby truth is apprehended. How otherwise shall we explain the Sermon on the Mount, his habitual use of parables, his constant efforts to illustrate truth through the medium of things familiar to his pupils? The imparting of information was evidently one of his chief objectives. Any theory of education which belittles the importance of information can hardly be in harmony with the pedagogy of Jesus. We may conclude therefore that religious educators who make the imparting of information an im-

portant part of their program are not fundamentally wrong. They may rely on this phase of the educative process too exclusively or they may err in the methods they use for imparting information, but in believing that the giving of information is an important part of religious teaching, they are not mistaken.

The group of teachers we are considering have not gone astray in their conviction that the training of pupils in worship is a part of the educational task. They may have blundered in their methods here as in their efforts to impart information, but their program has not been fundamentally wrong, it was built on the needs of the pupil and on the capacities of the pupil. In a preceding chapter we considered how Jesus sought to develop the emotional life of his pupils, training them in worship and seeking to develop within them love and sympathy with their fellow men.

Nor is it quite just to assume that this group of teachers have made no use of purposive choice as an educational agency. One purposive choice they have usually kept in mind as the goal of all their efforts, the choice by their pupils of Jesus as Saviour and Lord. They have conceived of religious education as centering in this goal, rather than in a multitude of lesser "outcomes." Nor will a thoughtful educator flippantly declare that they have been altogether wrong in this. Is there not, in fact, one great goal of Christian teaching, a goal which comprehends all others as corollaries and details; and is not this goal an open and sincere acceptance of

Jesus as Saviour and Lord? A system of education which loses sight of this primary objective of religious teaching becomes mere moral and ethical culture.

We may therefore conclude that the teaching methods of the group we are discussing is fundamentally in harmony with the teaching methods of Jesus. Nevertheless a comparison of their methods with the methods of the Master Teacher reveals some serious shortcomings in their pedagogy. Jesus evidently recognized the fact that purposive choices in concrete situations have potent educational value. His first followers were called upon to choose between the comparative comfort of their customary occupations and the hazards of a new and unfamiliar way of life. Some of them left lucrative employment to become homeless wanderers. In his dealings with his disciples Jesus repeatedly called upon them for decisions of grave importance. Jesus evidently recognized the fact that even well-learned truths may fail to register themselves in life and conduct. We have already considered the expressional phases of his pedagogy. Teachers who rely exclusively on the imparting of information are following the Great Teacher only from afar; they overlook the fact that practical and personal problems have an immense teaching value and that purposive choices are in many cases essential to efficient teaching.

A Solution Which Makes Purposive Choice Either the Most Important or the Exclusive Factor in the Educative Process. We must now consider

the other theory as to the place of purposive choice in the educative process. The situationist teacher assigns to purposive choice a very important rôle and makes it the well-nigh exclusive agency for the education of the individual. In insisting that the educative process is never complete without expression in life and action, the situationist psychologist is quite right. In this, however, he has made no new discovery. The fact was quite well known to the prophet Micah and it is admirably expressed in the Epistle of James. But this is not the matter on which the thoroughgoing situationist lays particular stress, though it is often confused with that which is his distinguishing tenet. The Situationist insists that there must be in connection with the teaching process as a whole, some definite situation which makes necessary a moral and religious choice. Information will be of value only when it is searched out and found in order to give light on the problem at hand. It is this central and distinguishing phase of the Situationist theory which we propose to consider at this point.

In emphasizing the importance of purposive choice in the educative process, the Situationist has rendered a service of no small value. But there seems to be reasons for fear lest his over-emphasis on this phase of education and his insistence on it as the exclusive educational agency, may neutralize the benefits which have been secured by the new outlook. It is time to check up on the matter.

Jesus certainly used other methods than those intended to bring his pupils into situations where

definite decisions would be required of them. His teaching was practical. It had to do with life. But with Jesus life was something more than the adjustment of an organism to its immediate environment. It seems certain that Jesus aimed to give his pupils a developed consciousness, an enriched and organized informational and emotional background which would enable them to solve the many and varied problems which are forever arising in the life of an individual who seeks to deal justly with his fellow men and to live righteously before God. There is scarcely any evidence that Jesus sought this end by leading his pupils through certain "typical situations." But there is abundant evidence that he sought it largely through storing their minds with truths, by developing their altruistic and devotional emotions, and be securing their loyalty to high ideals concerning their duties to a personal God and their obligations to their fellow men. His aims were not narrowed down to specific situations present or prospective. They were general. He had in mind a strong and unified personality which would meet any test. The situationist educator fails to take into account all the antecedents and all of the constituent elements of purposive choice. He thinks of choice in mechanical terms and fails to see that choices which are mechanical cease to be purposive. A purposive choice presupposes an impelling motive and motives are dependent upon knowledge and emotion more than they are upon any mere mechanical arrangement in the nervous system which has been established through definite decisions previ-

ously made in concrete situations. If we insist that only definite decisions in the presence of concrete situations have any educational value, we are getting back to a mechanical theory of life and conduct not unlike that of the mechanistic psychologists. Indeed the situationist theory of education is intimately related to Behaviorism and mechanistic psychology in its principles and in its origin.

Definite decisions make up a part of the experience of a normal individual, but they by no means constitute the whole of it. To confine education to those experiences wherein the individual exercises purposive choice, is to confine it within a narrow segment of the individual's experience and to deny educative influence to the greater part of human experience. Is it not withal a more reasonable view to assume that any experience may have educational value? A boy reads the life of Abraham Lincoln. He reads it in a corner somewhere and as he reads he is largely unconscious of his environment. He is not face to face with any situation demanding an immediate choice, yet who shall say that the reading of the book can have no possible effect over his life and conduct as a boy and as a man?

The emphasis which the situationist places on activity as an element in the educative process is apt to be salutary. We have had too much abstract information with too little provision for putting that information into practice. Nevertheless, the new emphasis on activity as a factor in religious education may become mischievous if it is carried to an extreme. The new emphasis is right as a

positive assertion, but when it takes the form of sweeping negations concerning other elements of the educative process it becomes a menace. We must not forget that the educational value of activity is not in the things the pupils do so much as in the motives which lie back of the things the pupils do, and of which the doing is only an expression. An inadequately motivated program of religious activities will be quite as barren of permanent results as any of our inadequately expressed programs have been.

The most serious defects of the situationist attitude towards religious education lies in its inaccurate conception as to the nature and origin of Christian ideals. This defect appears in a statement by Mr. Shaver concerning what experiences may have educational value. He says, "*Experience is educative only to the extent to which it is psychologically complete.* An analysis of the process by which changes are made in the individual shows it divided into two elements. On the one hand, the learner or experiencer, met by a new situation, senses its stimulus or stimuli. On the other hand, if he is to meet it successfully he must make some response. Thus he is changed and equipped to live satisfactorily in the new world about him only as new neurone connections are actually made. Merely knowing that they ought to be made, or how they should be made, or simply desiring to make them, is not enough. The neurone circuit is incomplete. The experience unit in which activity is limited to receiving impressions is after all a very unsatisfac-

tory experience. The impressions lose their force quickly; their meaning is never really discovered. But when the new situation demands brain activity, or thinking, and when thinking continues until complete adjustment is made to the new situation, the unity of experience gives assurance that a lasting change has taken place in the learner. There is thus a difference between learning about, and learning by doing." [2]

Mr. Shaver in the paragraph just quoted gives a fair statement of the situationist view of the educative process. There must be a new situation demanding some sort of adjustment on the part of the individual who finds himself face to face with the said situation. There is no educational result unless the learner actually adjusts himself to the new situation. Merely knowing how he may adjust himself; merely feeling that he ought to adjust himself; merely desiring to adjust himself;—these are of no value at all unless the learner does something which brings about an actual adjustment and the educational result is in direct proportion to the completeness of this adjustment.

Perhaps we can best understand the significance of this theory for the whole system of Christian ideals by using a scriptural illustration. As Jesus and his disciples gathered in the upper room on the night on which he was betrayed, the disciples were disputing among themselves as to which of them should be greatest in the earthly kingdom which

[2] Shaver: "The Project Principle in Religious Education," pages 5 and 6.

they believed Jesus was about to establish. In order to give them one last lesson on humility and service, Jesus took a towel and girding himself he washed his disciples' feet. Then he told his disciples that they ought to wash one another's feet. We have no evidence that the disciples did anything then and there which would give the Master's lesson pedagogical completeness of the kind the situationist declares to be essential to any efficiency in the teaching process. The Teacher showed them how they could be humble servants to one another. He told them that they ought to do as they had seen him do. We may assume that some of them desired to become like their Great Teacher in his humility and his willingness to serve. Indeed, Peter intimated as much in his enthusiastic invitation to Jesus to wash not only his feet but his hands and his head if such ablutions would enable him to have part with his Lord. Here are the very words which Mr. Shaver has used: the disciples saw *how* they could be like their Teacher, they felt they *ought* to do as he had done, they *desired* to do as he had done and to be like him. Yet Mr. Shaver intimates that this knowledge concerning what true greatness and true service really are, this sense of oughtness, this desire to attain the high spiritual level of their Teacher, have little or no educational value; that the lesson taught by the Great Teacher could have value for the disciples only as they arrived at a complete and actual adjustment to their experience.

Jesus gave his disciples an ideal that night in the upper room. It was a perfect ideal. It lay far

beyond the possibility of immediate attainment. It was something which they could strive for as long as they lived. The experience through which the disciples came into possession of this ideal was conspicuously lacking in that kind of psychological completeness which the situationist declares to be essential to the educative process. The disciples could not adjust themselves to it then and there. To bring their actions into harmony with it was a life-long task; a task in which they made progress, but which we may believe was still incomplete when they passed from earth to the life which lies beyond. If the situationist theory menaces ideals like that which we have been considering, it menaces the Christian religion, for if we take such ideals out of the Christian religion that which we have left is not worthy of the name. The ideals of the Christian Religion are forward looking. They far outreach the experiences of any individual Christian, if the term experience is defined in such a way as to exclude knowledge of the unattained. The Christian forgets the things which he has accomplished, the experiences which have "psychological completeness," and presses on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. To educate is to lead out and Christian ideals are the greatest educative forces in all the world because they have the drawing power which experienced Christians have always assigned to them. If an educative procedure leads to lofty ideals and earnest striving to attain them, it is pedagogically complete though it may lack that "psychological complete-

ness" which comes with the attainment of ideals and their full expression in conduct.

The Broad Basis of the Pedagogy of Jesus. We have been considering two theories of education which become antagonistic only when one or the other of them lays claim to the whole field of education. The teaching methods of Jesus cannot be confined within the narrow limits of either theory. He called upon his disciples to make definite decisions in the presence of concrete situations and we may be sure that such decisions were a part of his program of education for them. But he did not confine his teaching to this one method. He evidently tried to show them how to do things which they were not ready to undertake immediately. He doubtless felt that he had taken a forward step in the education of his pupils when they manifested a sense of oughtness with regard to the higher things of life. He was patient with them when their spirits were willing though they failed on account of the weakness of the flesh. He left them with ideals concerning a kingdom of God on earth such as out-reached anything they had ever experienced; ideals concerning service and brotherhood which they were still incapable of attaining; ideals as to personal purity and goodness which made them feel that any righteousness which they had attained was but as filthy rags in the sight of God. If we call these concepts "empty abstractions" and deny that they can have any educational value, we deny the efficiency of the chief element in the pedagogy of Jesus; we part company with the Great Teacher

and launch out on a path of our own choosing. If we choose to act in such a fashion our choice will not be wholly unique. Others have done likewise, from time to time, during the centuries which have elapsed since Jesus lived and taught. Jesus said of himself, "I am the Light of the world." He mentioned no other light. If the light which we follow is not his it is not light, but darkness, and great is the darkness.

CHAPTER XV

The Nature of Truth: Is Truth Something Fixed and Eternal or Is It Something Relative and Changeable?

Philosophy has sometime been thought to have little significance for the practical affairs of life. Perhaps this conclusion is true concerning certain types of philosophy, but it is certainly not true of all philosophy. When philosophical thought deals with the sources of morality and religion, it becomes a matter of immense practical importance. Philosophical thought of this latter kind is apt to work secretly. It may be quite unknown to the masses of mankind and yet in the end it determines the thinking of the masses, and through controlling the thought processes of the multitudes it becomes the controlling factor in morals and religion, and that which touches the moral and religious side of man's nature, determines the destinies of nations. Philosophy is therefore apt to filter out into the life of a nation tinting the whole mental background of the population and writing itself largely in the history of human events.

History offers numerous illustrations of the power which philosophy possesses to mold the lives of men and nations. A subtle materialistic philosophy which reduced God to a nonentity always on the

side of the strongest legions was a primary cause of the World War. Some sort of philosophy is bound to underlie our system of religious education. Hence it is no discredit to our educational program of the past that it has rested on philosophy of a certain type. The contention is sometimes made that modern methods of teaching must be shifted from philosophical foundations to empirical foundations. This, however, is not the procedure which is being attempted. The ultra-liberal tendency in religious education is nothing more nor less than an attempt to shift religious education from one philosophical basis to another philosophical basis. The new basis of the ultra-liberals is a philosophical system called Pragmatism and it is this system which we are now to consider.

THE PRAGMATIC PHILOSOPHY

Pragmatism has been defined as "a way of looking at truth." It is more accurately designated as a theory concerning the reality and inherent nature of truth. The pragmatist does not think of truth as something fixed and eternal, as something which is universal. He thinks of truth as relative and temporary, as something individual rather than universal. The pragmatist makes truth to depend on experience, and so do we all in a way. There is this difference, however, and it is a matter of utmost importance. All philosophers would agree that truth is dependent upon experience for its existence as something known to man. But the pragmatist

denies to truth any existence beyond that which is discovered and known. He identifies truth with experience. With the pragmatist experience is not the discovery of previously existing truth, but the creation of a truth of a temporary and individual kind. (See note below.)

This is not the place for a lengthy examination of the logical foundations of the Pragmatic Philosophy, but one or two remarks along that line may help to clear the way for a consideration of the influence of Pragmatism in religious education. In most books written in support of Pragmatism there seems to be a confusing use of terms. The pragmatist uses the terms *belief*, *idea*, and *conception* as though they were synonymous with the term *truth*. One such writer recounts the changes which men's beliefs concerning the form of the earth have undergone and in a most astonishing way seems to assume that these changes prove that the truth concerning the earth's shape has been subject to constant change.[1] The pragmatist does not seem capable of understanding that the world was a sphere for untold ages before man conceived of it as spherical and that its form is not in any way modified by man's beliefs and conceptions concerning it. To make the truth concerning the shape of the earth dependent upon man's experiences with the earth does not matter very much although such a procedure cannot be other than irritating to a logically constituted

NOTE.—The word *pragmatism* is used in a variety of ways. It may mean a way of testing truth by experience. But there is only one Pragmatic Philosophy and that is the system of beliefs concerning the inherent nature of truth as set forth in the paragraphs above.

[1] Bower: "The Curriculum of Religious Education," page 43.

mind; but when this same procedure is applied to such matters as morality and religion the consequences are no longer negligible—they become serious and far-reaching.

Pragmatism has to do with the inherent nature of truth. It therefore touches religion at its foundations. It is nothing short of revolutionary in its influences upon religious education. I was about to say, "If Pragmatism is true, we have been woefully wrong in our conceptions concerning the nature of religion and in our whole scheme of religious education." But such a statement puzzles me. If Pragmatism is true, in what sense is it true; for whom is it true; how long has it been true; for how long will it continue to be true? Pragmatism as a system seems to be all up in the air. When we try to conceive of it in the light of its own definitions the foundations for logical thought are removed. Pragmatism has the appearance of being intellectual anarchy. Well, true or false, there is no harm in our seeking to discover what effects this system of philosophy will have on religious education.

Pragmatism and the Bible. The people who wrote the Bible were not pragmatists. When the conception of ethical monotheism entered the minds of the Hebrew prophets they were sure that they had apprehended eternal truth. The righteousness of their God, they believed, would endure forever. Their experiences with God bore internal testimonies concerning their own validity and concerning their universality.

What use can we make of the Bible if we give

our allegiance to a system of philosophy which holds that the teachings of the Bible may have been true for other generations, but may not be true for our own? There is a decreasing use of the Bible in church schools which have felt the touch of Pragmatism and this is just what we should expect. The pragmatist might look on the Bible as useful in a limited way as a book of suggested experiments in religion, but he could hardly assign it to any such place as it has long held in religious teaching.

If we conceive of the Bible as the record of a progressive apprehension of religious truth which found its completion in the life and teaching of Jesus, and likewise conceive of the discovered truths as having valid existence apart from our discovery of them, the Bible may remain as the religious guide book of the race. But if we must conclude that the truths revealed in the Bible are only relative and have no existence apart from our experience with them, then the Bible becomes a book of only minor importance in the teaching of religion.

Perhaps this is the place to examine a little more closely this pragmatic view of Biblical truth. We have reasons to believe that only those experiences which deal with some objective reality can be cumulative. The experiences of a man learning to drive an automobile are cumulative because he is dealing with objective realities, with things and situations which have an existence quite apart from his experience with them, and his conceptions concerning them. He thus discovers truths about automobile driving which enable him to develop skill in that

particular performance. Let us suppose the case of a man suffering from hallucinations who imagines himself as driving an automobile. There is no objective reality to this man's experiences. He is not dealing with objective truth though he is dealing with certain experiences. Such a man makes no sort of progress in the art of driving automobiles, because, while his experiences are true in so far as he is concerned, they do not have any relationships to objective reality. Now it is generally conceded that the Bible presentation of truth is cumulative. It reaches its climax in Jesus as the Great Teacher. The cumulative character of Biblical truth indicates that the experiences on which this truth is based were not devoid of connection with objective and independent reality.

Pragmatism and Jesus Christ. Pragmatists must, if they are logical, apply to Jesus and his teachings the same principles that they apply to other Bible characters and to other Bible teachings. They must hold that what Jesus taught may have been true for the people of his time, but that it may not be true for people of to-day. They must hold that while the conduct of Jesus may have been in perfect harmony with righteousness and truth in his day, there is no evidence that the same sort of conduct is in harmony with righteousness and truth in our day. They must go farther and maintain that what was right and true for Jesus may not have been right and true for other people of that time.

Whatever other defects of personality the typical pragmatist may have, we can hardly charge him

with being deficient in that particular form of courage which manifests itself in the assertion of new and daring theories and the assumption of iconoclastic positions. Nevertheless, there does not seem to have been, as yet, even one pragmatist who has possessed the hardihood to follow to their logical conclusions his theories as they relate themselves to the life and teachings of Jesus. It seems probable that no honest and well-informed mind can ever think of Jesus in terms of Pragmatic Philosophy.

Pragmatism and Our Whole Religious Heritage. We have seen how Pragmatic Philosophy strikes at the sources of the Christian religion by raising doubts concerning the abiding truth of the Christian's most cherished beliefs. But it goes farther. It discredits not only Bible records, but the testimony of all the generations which have come and gone since the Bible was written. The truths for which martyrs died may no longer be truths for us, if Pragmatism is a true theory. If Pragmatism is a correct theory, church history as well as the Bible stand discredited as sources of religious guidance. It is little wonder that the pragmatist breaks so completely with what has all along been considered to be a priceless religious heritage and makes religious education to center wholly in present individual and social experience.

If Pragmatism is true there is no sure and abiding value in the great hymns of the Church, no evidence that they express anything that is true and valuable for the youth of to-day. If Pragmatism is true the sacred ordinances which the Church has so long cher-

ished must be reëxamined and subjected to measurements and tests to determine whether they serve any useful purpose in developing the religious life, whether they are still related in any way to that which is true. If this philosophy be in harmony with fact, our whole religious heritage stands discredited; we have no sure foundations; religious education is endless experimentation and nothing else.

It seems that such a philosophy as we have been considering must inevitably take all spirit and force out of religious teaching. The great religious teachers of the race have been persons who could say, "I know the truth of that whereof I speak." They have been persons thoroughly convinced as to the universality of the truths they proclaimed. Without this confidence teaching must of necessity become timid and half-hearted. The enthusiasm with which some pragmatists proclaim their peculiar doctrines suggests that in so far as Pragmatism itself is concerned they are not pragmatists.

The emphasis which the pragmatist places on personal experience in the educative process seems rather strange when we remember that he holds there is no objective and eternal truth. Without such a truth, personal experience like all the past experience of the race must be regarded as of only transient value. Through personal experience the individual, according to the pragmatic theory, is gathering only a congeries of temporary truths which may dissolve at any moment. How different is the case of one who is convinced that he is laying

hold of eternal truth; who like the aged Victor Hugo can say, "I know that my head is rising into the light of eternal day!" Take this confidence out of personal experience and it ceases to be as efficient an agency of education as it is under the non-Pragmatic conception of truth.

Pragmatism and Established Standards of Conduct. Pragmatists rejoice in the fact that their philosophy is destructive to religious dogmas. Have they considered the fact that it is equally destructive to standards of conduct? If there is no absolute truth, there is no absolute right, no absolute good, no absolute wrong. Our moral and social standards are set up in harmony with what we and our ancestors conceived of as right and good. They are founded on dogmatic beliefs in the field of conduct, quite as truly as theological doctrines are founded on dogmatic beliefs as to religious realities. What if the youth of to-day, admitting our standards of conduct to have been true and valuable for past generations, decide that they are no longer true and valuable for the life of to-day? What if they say, "Monogamy was all right for our forbears, but we will try something different?" [2] Children and youth should indeed prize the lessons of experience, but common sense suggests that there are some experiments which have been tried enough in the history of the race and which youth had better let alone.

Pragmatism looks like a philosophical anarchy

[2] The author of a book which has just come from the press refers to the Seventh Commandment as a "sex taboo," and says that those who formulated it did not speak with any authority for us.

which would encourage social anarchy. It menaces our whole moral and religious heritage. It contains within it the germs of universal negation and therefore of self-destruction. If there is no universal and abiding truth, there is no truth worthy of the name, there is no such thing as an "order of nature," the heart of the universe is a Chaos.

WHAT JESUS TAUGHT CONCERNING THE NATURE OF TRUTH

Pragmatic philosophy is closely related to the Annoyer-Satisfier theory which we considered in a preceding chapter. They are so closely related that Henry Walgrave Stuart has united them under the general term "Instrumentalism." He says, "In the logic of instrumentalism, truth has been identified with usefulness and the good with the satisfactory." [3] To identify truth with usefulness is Pragmatism and to identify the good with the satisfactory is the central theory of the Annoyer-Satisfier explanation of human conduct. We have seen how the Annoyer-Satisfier explanation of conduct fails to agree with the teachings of Jesus and how completely it falls short of offering a foundation for the matchless life which he lived. Jesus did not identify good with satisfactions, nor did he identify evil with annoyances. Did he identify truth with usefulness?

Jesus Recognized the Fact that Man's Understanding of Truth Is Imperfect. Jesus said to the

[3] Stuart: "Creative Intelligence," page 282.

Jews who had just begun to believe in him, "If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." In his whole teaching ministry he acted in such a way as to suggest that he regarded practically all men as possessing some inklings of truth. His objective stands out plainly as an abiding aim to help people grasp an ever enlarging measure of truth. He recognized the truth revealed in the Prophets and the Law, but he declared that he had come to fulfill the truth which the Old Testament only partly revealed.

After he had been with his disciples for some three years he told them that he had many things yet to reveal unto them. He promised them and their successors a progressive revelation of truth under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth. He laid hold on the truth in the minds of his pupils, however limited it might be, and by enlarging and enriching their knowledge of the truth, he led them on toward the goal. How little truth there was, for example, in the conceptions of the disciples concerning the nature of the kingdom which Jesus had come to set up on earth. There was much of error and little of truth in these conceptions of the disciples concerning the Kingdom of God, and yet Jesus succeeded in eliminating the error and in developing the truth until the disciples were fitted to take up the great task of building the kind of Kingdom their Teacher had in view.

Jesus Did Not Confuse Man's Conception of Truth with the Truth Itself. Jesus conceived of

man's conceptions of truth as changeable and he built his educational program on a faith in the possibility of such changes, but there is no evidence whatever that he thought of truth itself as changeable. The Hebrews had thought of one particular spot as being peculiarly the place where Jehovah was to be worshiped. They had differed with their Samaritan neighbors as to the location of that spot. The Hebrews believed that on Mount Moriah in Jerusalem was the place where men ought to worship, while the Samaritans believed that the place of worship should be on Mount Gerizim in Samaria. Jesus taught the woman of Samaria that this seemingly important issue as to the correct place of worship would vanish as soon as men should grasp in a larger way the truth concerning God; the nature of his being, his omnipresence, and his passionate longing for fellowship with his earthly children through worship. "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshipers. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth."

How shall we interpret these sublime words of Jesus if we yield assent to the Pragmatic Philosophy? Shall we say that the Deity did not, in truth, exist as Spirit, that he was not omnipresent, that he was not seeking fellowship with man, until he was experienced in these various ways by human individuals? Shall we belittle that sublime conception of the Deity which Jesus announced, there by the well

of Sychar, by saying that the new conception which he set forth was in no sense truer than the conceptions then prevailing among Jews and Samaritans, only as it was more useful? Shall we say that the Great Teacher knew that he was revealing only a temporary and relative sort of truth, one which would not last through the centuries because it would somewhere in the changing conditions of human life cease to be useful? We know that Jesus had quite another opinion concerning the permanence of the truths he expressed. He said that heaven and earth should pass away, but his words should never pass away. How much more reasonable to believe that Jesus thought of himself as revealing truths which possessed objective reality and universal application and enduring value! The whole weight of evidence seems to be in favor of the conclusion that Jesus thus thought; and that he thought aright the centuries that have elapsed bear witness. Pragmatic philosophy and the pedagogy of Jesus are incompatible.

Jesus Believed in the Existence of Truth as an Eternal and Unchangeable Reality. The conversation of Jesus mentioned in the preceding paragraph justifies the inferences which were there drawn from it; but we have more direct evidences as to the ideas of Jesus concerning the nature of truth. He made some direct statements concerning the matter. He associated truth with the Deity for he spoke of "The Spirit of truth that proceedeth from the Father." He associated truth with his own innermost self, for he said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life."

He said he came into the world to bear witness to the truth.

Jesus so honored truth and so emphasized it that his disciples ever afterward associated it with his name. They believed him to be the source of truth for they went about saying that grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. They spoke of the followers of Jesus as those who were walking in the truth. In all this they were but reflecting the conceptions concerning the nature of truth which their Teacher had taught them.

The Conduct of Jesus Indicates that He Regarded Truth as Eternal and Unchangeable. Not only the utterances of Jesus but his actions bear witness to his reverence for truth. He moved in the midst of an appalling entanglement of untruth. There was untruth in the gossip concerning him which went buzzing up and down the thoroughfares of Judæa and Galilee. There was untruth in the prevailing attitudes of the multitudes toward him. There was untruth in the prejudices against him which so soon became manifest in the leaders of the Jewish church. There was untruth in the charges lodged against him in the trial before the Sanhedrin and before the court of Pilate. In the midst of this appalling entanglement of falseness, Jesus moved on in absolute devotion to the truth. That loyalty endured even unto death. "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" cried the enraged Caiaphas in the face of Jesus, and Jesus answered, "I am." He knew that such an answer meant crucifixion, yet he told the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth.

Alone with Pilate in the Prætorium with the impatient mobs outside crying aloud for his death, Jesus said to the Roman governor, "I am a king. To this end I have been born, and to this end came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." The perplexed governor could only answer, "What is truth?" He might well ask the question, for he was quite a stranger to that sense of truth for which Jesus was willing to lay down his life.

The pragmatist insists that for the enlightened mind, "truth has been identified with usefulness." Let us see how this definition of truth fits into the scenes which we have been considering. The high priest and the members of the Sanhedrin brought Jesus before Pilate saying, "We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying that he himself is Christ, a king." This statement is in part a cunning perversion of what Jesus had said and claimed. Part of it is wholly false. Jesus had not refused to give tribute to Cæsar; on the other hand he had said, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." In spirit and intent the statement is absolutely false, it was not in accordance with the facts.

And yet the statement was highly useful to those who made it. Pilate quailed every time he heard the name of Cæsar. It was when he heard the cry, "If thou lettest this man go thou art not Cæsar's friend," that he delivered Jesus to be crucified. Was the statement true because it was useful? What sort of sense is there in confusing two such

well-understood terms as *true* and *useful*. The makers of our dictionaries define truth as "conformity to fact or reality; exact accordance with that which is, or has been, or shall be." They define the term useful as "that which is serviceable, that which is advantageous, that which has utility." These definitions indicate that, in the opinion of those who wrote our lexicons, the terms *truth* and *usefulness* not only differ widely in meaning, but that they belong to different categories. They apply to incommensurable things.

Is There Any Possible Benefit for Religious Education in the Pragmatic Philosophy? Most of the theories we have thus far considered in this book possess at least some latent possibilities of good. Most of them become dangerous only when they begin to assume a universality which they cannot rightly claim, and likewise begin to utter sweeping negations concerning other elements of the educative process. Is this the case with Pragmatic Philosophy? From the point of view of the present discussion the answer is an emphatic negative. Pragmatism offers no benefits which may not be attained in safer ways. It is essentially false in its fundamental assertions concerning the nature of truth, and its spread in the schools of the Church cannot be viewed with anything less than alarm.

CHAPTER XVI

Has the Christian Religion a Gospel Message or only a Continuing Program of Social Experimentation?

A committee connected with a national organization of religious educators was discussing not long ago a proposed standard for Sunday schools. One member proposed an additional phrase wherein the word "instruction" appeared. Another member objected to any use of the word "instruction" because it suggested that "we have something to tell the child." He insisted that the use of the word would be misunderstood; people would conclude that the committee had the old-fashioned notion that "telling" has a place in education.

The committee member who objected to any word which might suggest the possibility that, in the opinion of the committee, we have something to tell children, is at the head of one of the largest schools of religious education in America. Classes in this school are crowded with young people who have come from all sections of the country to study religious education and to prepare for religious teaching as a lifework. The opinions of this particular professor, therefore, have peculiar significance. They are being carried out into the Church and their influence is beginning to be widely felt. Indeed, there are sections of the Church where these

opinions dominate the educational procedure in a thorough-going fashion.

If all "telling" is to be eliminated from religious teaching, we have come to a time, not only of profound change in church school methods, but to a time of revolutionary changes in our conceptions concerning the Christian religion. The position assumed by those who discredit "telling" repudiates not only the customary pedagogy of the Church, but challenges the whole content of its teaching. Their position must therefore be examined in the light of these larger relationships. If as teachers of the young we have nothing to tell our pupils we must be content to think of the Christian religion as possessing no gospel message, as being nothing but a continuing process of social experimentation. It is worth noting that this repudiation of "telling" is a logical outcome of the Pragmatic philosophy, which we have considered in the preceding chapter.

Background of the Interdict against "Telling." Other causes besides Pragmatic philosophy have contributed toward this growing revolt against the imparting of information as a part of the educational process. If we are to understand the situation as it now presents itself in the school of the Church we must take these other causes into consideration. In a sense this revolt against the informational phases of the teaching process is a natural result of the too exclusive emphasis which has been given to this phase of teaching in the past. We have appeared to think that the giving of information about religion was the whole task of the re-

ligious teacher. In fact, this inadequate type of teaching in the church school grew up, not as a result of definite conceptions as to the nature of the educative process, but rather as a result of an attempt to teach religion on a hopelessly inadequate time basis. Church school teachers had only a meager time allowance for teaching and they fell into the habit of using such time as they possessed for the imparting of information. Since information is most quickly imparted by direct telling, they fell into the habit of using that method almost exclusively. Such teaching cannot be said to have been utterly barren. The truths told by Sunday school teachers to children and youth have borne fruit. It has of course not been as fruitful as religious teaching ought to be.

The revolt against "telling," however, did not arise chiefly from the fact that teaching which is merely informational is apt to be devoid of large results. That extreme position which demands that all "telling" be eliminated from the educative process had another origin. It is a fruit of that mechanistic interpretation of life and conduct which has come out of a thorough-going Behavioristic psychology. If consciousness is only a meaningless accompaniment of our experiences, all attempts to enlighten it are of course wasted effort.

A little less drastic attitude against "telling" is assumed by educators dominated by the Annoyer-Satisfier theory of Thorndike. They concede that the gaining of information may have educational value when the individual is face to face with a

situation demanding a choice. Under these circumstances anything that helps the individual to make a satisfactory adjustment of himself to his environment will have educational value. The thorough-going Behaviorist conceives of man as a much developed amœba and insists that you cannot "tell" him anything. The moderate Behaviorist believes that "telling" may have value if it comes at the exact moment when it is needed to enable the individual to secure some satisfaction, or avoid some annoyance.

A Theoretical Solution and a Common-Sense Solution. What has been said indicates that the extreme reaction against the informational phases of the educative process are due to theories. It is not due to the defective results which appear when the information-imparting method of teaching is relied upon too exclusively. The revolt is not founded on a scientific analysis of religious teaching nor is it founded upon any detailed measurements of the results which appear under this admittedly defective kind of teaching. A common sense approach to the problem; and likewise a scientific approach for true science is always sensible; would consist in a study of the results of the purely informational type of teaching. Such studies have been made and they have shown that while teaching of the purely informational kind is defective, often sadly defective, it is rarely devoid of all beneficial results. The thorough-going rejection of "telling" as it is now manifest in certain sections of the church school would be justifiable if it could be shown that the "telling" of religious truth is never productive of

good and it is justifiable on no other grounds. In promoting the revolt religious educational leaders are indulging in an unscientific and mischievous procedure. A common-sense and scientific approach to the problem reveals the defects of the purely informational type of teaching, reveals its weaknesses, its inadequacies, and makes plain the available remedies. In order that all who read these words may see clearly wherein these extremists who reject all "telling" as useless are fundamentally wrong, we must look at the problem in one or two slightly different ways.

The Problem in the Light of Child Psychology. It is hard to understand how any one who has had much to do with children can be persuaded that "telling" has no place in education. Such people must have studied amœbas more than they have studied children. The normal child is hungry for information and he does not object when this information comes in the form of "telling." He is a creature of a thousand questions and his outreachings for truth are by no means confined to such information as will enable him to solve some problem of his immediate environment. His need is often an inner one. He searches for that which will enable him to set his intellectual house in order, not merely for that which will enable him to adjust himself as an animal organism to his physical and social environment. Herbart was a great educational philosopher because he recognized these intellectual needs of the child mind and built his educational procedure upon them.

How even a confirmed Behaviorist can overlook

this intellectual hunger of the child and confine his observations to what the child does and then imagine that he has solved the deepest problems of child life and child conduct, is certainly difficult to understand. Why all this searching after information if consciousness is only a meaningless accompaniment of conduct determined by mechanical reflexes of the nervous system?

The Problem in Public School Experience. Church School leaders may learn something concerning this problem from public school experience. Twenty-five years ago there was a revolt against "telling" as a method in public school teaching. The revolt had to do at that time chiefly with the teaching of science. There were educators who maintained that in so far as the teaching of the sciences was concerned "telling" must be eliminated; the pupil must be given an opportunity to make investigations for himself; scientific facts must be discovered through experimentation by the pupil. Hardly anybody is trying to teach science to-day in the way the revolters against "telling" said, twenty-five years ago, that it must be taught. Pupils perform experiments, it is true, but they are not expected to gather all they need to know in that way. Teachers of science no longer fear to "tell" their pupils scientific truths either by word of mouth or through a textbook.

How simple it all seems to those of us who look back on that public school movement of twenty-five years ago! We can see just how it happened. Science had been taught from textbooks almost ex-

clusively, and the change from the textbook method to a method wherein there was experimentation and discovery for the pupil was indeed a marked improvement. But we can also see how enthusiasm for the new method ran away with itself; how the supporters of the new approach began to utter sweeping assertions as to the universality of this particular way of teaching and how they likewise uttered sweeping denials as to the possibility of value in any other method. Experimentation has now found approximately its legitimate place in the teaching of science. The old-fashioned textbook method is practically extinct, but the exaggerated and exclusive emphasis on experimentation has likewise disappeared. It is reasonable to suppose that the church school revolt against "telling" will have a similar issue.

The Limitations of Experimental Learning. As religious educators we need to come to some sort of agreement as to just what we are to include in the term "experience." When you tell a story to a child and the child listens with interest, does the child have an experience which may possess educational value? If we answer this question in the affirmative, the thorough-going rejection of "telling" as an educational device is unreasonable. If we answer it in the negative, we must face the fact that experimental learning is, as thus defined, a very narrow thing and one not entirely safe or altogether adequate. Religious education thus defined in terms of a narrowly conceived definition of experience will be robbed of some chief values in

literature and in social relationships. It will become narrowly individualistic and the learner will be largely cut off from the social inheritance of the race.

Religious education restricted to learning through personal experience would be unsafe. Dr. Coe has said, "There are fields into which the pupil should be induced as far as possible through his own convictions not to enter." [1] We must tell our children about the effects of strychnine and not allow them to discover its effects through personal experience. We had best recognize that there are poisons of another kind and that it is our duty to tell our children about them. Experimental learning therefore has its limitations quite as truly as the "telling" method of teaching has its limitations. We shall think more clearly if we agree that education may take place in both ways, through personal experience and through hearing about the experiences of other people.

The Importance of the Problem for Religious Education. It is difficult to see how secular education could be carried on without considerable outright "telling." The pupil who is to know astronomy will need to be told concerning the discoveries of Kepler and others. How shall a pupil gain a knowledge of electricity if his teachers are mute concerning the findings of Edison? After what fashion will you teach history if all "telling" is to be discarded? The extremist's revolt against the informational phases of education is nothing but a swing from one absurdity to another. The total

[1] Coe: "Law and Freedom in the School," page 22.

reliance on information-giving was absurd enough, but the total exclusion of it is worse.

However important the problem may be for secular education, it is far more significant for religious education. The program of the Christian Church for a period of nearly two thousand years has been constructed on the belief that the Christian religion has a gospel message. The Church has believed that it has a story to tell to the nations. It has believed that this message is something more than accumulated human experience, however important an element such experience may be as an element of the message. It has believed that our light has come in the person of a human-divine Teacher who was faultless in his life and in his teaching. Let us not deceive ourselves by assuming that we can still hold these beliefs and at the same time give our allegiance to a pedagogy which is based on their repudiation. If the Christian Church has no gospel message, the best we can do is to launch an on-going program of social experimentation; though it is not quite clear just how even this can be done without more or less "telling."

"Telling" in the Pedagogy of Jesus. It is quite impossible to bring the teaching methods of Jesus into line with the theories of those who would eliminate the informational phases of education. He was continually giving his pupils information. He gave them such information as was needed when they were face to face with a situation demanding a choice, but he also gave them information under other circumstances. He evidently gave much religious information confidently expecting that it

would become a part of the intellectual background of his pupils, manifesting itself as attitudes and ideals and capable of helping the pupil to make right choices in a wide range of situations. He seems to have taken the common-sense view that a well-informed mind is capable of thinking clearly and accurately on matters of conduct and is therefore more likely to make right choices than is the case with an uninformed and confused mind. The Great Teacher sometimes told his pupils things which they could comprehend in only the dimmest sort of way and which they were not yet capable of applying to their own conduct. He did things that puzzled them greatly. He once said to one of them, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." True teachers of the Christian religion must be like their Leader. They must not be too much bound by that which is immediately practicable. They must take a long look ahead and think of their pupils as they will be not merely of them as they are.

Jesus made much use of "telling" because it had to do with thought. He knew that in touching the thinking of his pupils he was touching their lives. He put great emphasis on thinking. He believed that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." He taught his disciples to believe that evil acts were the expression of evil thoughts, that good acts were the result of right thoughts. His pedagogy cannot be reconciled with any theory which holds that thinking always follows action as a result and never precedes it as a cause.

Jesus believed that in his life and teachings he was giving the world a gospel message. He foresaw the time when that message should be proclaimed over all the earth. His last admonition to his followers was a command to go forth into all the earth and to tell to the whole creation the things which he had taught them.

The disciples of Jesus took up their task of winning the world for their Master by following explicitly the commandment which he had given them. They went forth with a gospel message to proclaim. They told the multitudes about Jesus. They told about him so effectively that thousands of their fellow-countrymen believed on him and accepted him as the Messiah. When they crossed over the boundaries of Judæa they did not change their methods. They told their story in Antioch, in Corinth, in Rome; and the telling of their story shook the foundations of a world empire. It was no mere social experimentation that the disciples of Jesus promoted in these early days of the Christian Church. Profound social changes came as a result of their work, but they came as a result of new ideals and new attitudes born of the gospel message, not as results of experiments in social living. The disciples taught life-transforming and empire-shaking truths which they had learned from Jesus. They gave to all who were ready and willing to receive them truths concerning God, truths concerning man's relationships to God, truths concerning the way in which man may be right with God. They presented these truths confident of their supreme

value and without any proposal concerning a tentative acceptance of them, without any suggestion that they should be made the basis of experimentation and accepted if they proved satisfactory.

The Eskimo of the Northwest Passage. Perhaps this discussion has already reached a point where it has become tedious. The theory with which we are dealing is, however, such a mischievous one that we must dispose of it as thoroughly as we can while we are dealing with it. Nothing less than the gospel of the Christian Church is at stake.

We are by no means confined to the Apostolic Age for our illustrations of the power of the gospel message when it is told by believing followers of Jesus. Every mission field of to-day abounds with these illustrations. Our final illustration, however, is not drawn from missionary annals, but from the pages of a popular magazine of to-day.[2]

The Eskimos of the Northwest Passage have been until with the past few years an almost unknown race. When Knud Rasmussen, leader of the Fifth Thule Expedition, went among them he found them to be a peculiarly primitive people. He found that a state of affairs dreadful to civilized society, and indeed distressing to the natives themselves, prevailed among these Eskimos. Girl babies were unwelcome in the homes of these people and it was a custom to destroy all such at birth unless they had been promised in marriage before they were born. As a consequence women were very scarce in the native settlements. There was almost continual fighting among the men because of this scar-

[2] *The World's Work*, September, 1925.

city of women in the tribe. Wife-stealing and homicide were almost everyday occurrences. Mr. Rasmussen estimated that sixty-five per cent of the men were homicides and that practically every adult woman in the tribe had taken the life of at least one of her own children.

Christian missionaries have now found their way to these Eskimos and their coming has brought about marked changes. Mr. Rasmussen says of these missionaries, "I should be neglecting the responsibility I feel toward all the Eskimo tribes I have visited, if I did not call attention to the fact that in all the eastern parts where teachers and missionaries have been at work there has arisen among the people a strong feeling against murder and infanticide."

How shall we explain this transformation within the social life of the Eskimos? Did they change their attitudes toward the centuries-old custom of their race because the white missionaries pointed out the evil effects of these customs? Those who have seen most of these particular Eskimos agree that the natives needed no such explanation. They knew very well the connection between their custom of slaying baby girls and the feuds which cost so many lives of adult tribesmen. The missionaries found that the Eskimos were quite aware of the causes which led to fighting and wife-stealing among their men. These missionaries were wise enough to pursue some other method than the proposal of some new social experiment as such. They told the gospel story. They told the Eskimos about the Jehovah God who had said, "Thou shalt not kill." They told them about God's love for little children, that

they are so precious in his sight that their angels stand always before the throne of God. They told them about Jesus who went about doing good, who took the children in his arms and blessed them.

This "telling" bore fruit. These ideas were no "empty abstractions" to the Eskimos. Gradually, and indeed more rapidly than we might expect, a change came over the spirit of the tribe. Individuals of the tribe were lifted, one by one, to higher moral grounds. Infanticide began to disappear. Murder began to seem an appalling thing. A social regeneration was under way.

Somehow I feel that the missionaries dealt with the problem wisely. They were not content to point out the "unsatisfactory" results of the tribal customs. They did not base their appeal on selfishness but on latent altruistic possibilities within the hearts of the native folk. They did not confine their attention to the social problems of the tribe in any narrow way, they hardly dealt with them at all, as such. The methods of the missionaries went underneath these problems and beyond them and all around them. There was no suggestion that a better way be found though social experimentation. Truths, ideals, and new attitudes were presented as they are contained in the gospel message of historical Christianity and the gospel message bore fruit. The way of salvation for the Eskimo is the way of salvation for our whole sin-blighted race and it is the way of the Christian gospel. We must not lose that way through confused allegiance to any theory which discredits the gospel message.

CHAPTER XVII

A Christ-Centered Program of Religious Education

For several years religious educators have been groping after a central and organizing principle about which the religious educational program of the Protestant Church may be built. Religious education was church-centered from about the close of the fourth century to the time of Luther and Calvin. During all these centuries education was ecclesiastical in character. One of its main objectives was the exaltation of the Church as an institution through the ordinances of which individuals had access to spiritual values in this world and to eternal life in a world to come. The Protestant Reformation brought about a change of educational emphasis in those sections of Christendom which at that time renounced the leadership of the Roman church. Vestiges of the Roman conceptions are still evident in a few Protestant denominations, but for the most part Protestant bodies have shifted the educational emphasis from the Church to the scriptures and the doctrines which the scriptures seem to them to set forth.

The Curriculum-Centered Program. It is probable that no group of Protestant educators ever chose the term "curriculum-centered program" as a desig-

nation of their educational aims and ideals. The phrase arose as a term of reproach concerning the character of the customary educational program of Protestant churches. As is so often the case with reproachful epithets, it is not altogether just. Those who planned the customary educational program which has been carried on in the past did not think of the curriculum as an end in itself. They took it for granted that an efficient teaching of the scriptures would lead to the conversion of the pupil and to all the characteristics of the religious life which ought to follow that event. Their goal was really the religious development of the pupil, not the mere teaching of the Bible.

Nevertheless, a lack of knowledge concerning the pupil and the consequent failure to teach the scriptures in a highly successful way did result in a program which was practically curriculum-centered. In so far as these teachers fell short of their goal for the religious development of their pupils, by just so much their curriculum may be said to have centered in itself and not in the pupils.

This centering of attention on the curriculum as such led to some serious blunders in church school administration and in church school teaching. It is largely responsible for the adoption of the Uniform Lesson plan and for the persistent use of that plan down to the present day. It delayed departmental organization. It even had effects on church architecture and is chiefly responsible for the deplorable Akron Plan of church school building. On the whole, the habit of thinking exclusively in terms

of the curriculum has been rather disastrous to the school of the church. We shall never have an efficient church school program until we recognize fully the fact that pupils differ with age and that we must take these differences into account in building our educational program.

The Pupil-Centered Program. Dissatisfaction with the customary educational program of the Church and the development of child-study as a science led to a demand for a "pupil-centered program of religious education." In their efforts to establish church school teaching on this new basis religious educators began with the needs of the pupil; at least they laid claim to this sort of an approach. There has been some confusion of thought as to just what is implied in a pupil-centered program. Some have seemed to assume that because a program contained much extra-Biblical material it was necessarily pupil-centered. As a matter of fact the presence or absence of extra-Biblical material is an unreliable datum on which to base a judgment as to whether or not the material is pupil-centered. One program builder selects from the Bible such portions as he thinks will meet the needs of a particular group of pupils, while another program builder makes his selections more largely from extra-Biblical sources with the same ends in view; and one program is as much pupil-centered as the other.

The change of emphasis from the curriculum to the pupil was on the whole beneficial. It opened the way for graded lessons. It led to departmental organization. It encouraged better methods of

teaching and put new vigor into teacher training.

Nevertheless, the development of the pupil-centered program has brought to light certain facts which have caused thoughtful religious educators to doubt whether we have yet discovered that central and organizing principle about which the whole church school program may be organized. It is a significant fact that the term "pupil-centered program" is passing out of vogue. We are beginning to wonder whether the pupil may not have needs of which he is not conscious and which do not appear in his behavior no matter how closely we may scrutinize it. Perhaps the old-fashioned curriculum-centered program with its emphasis on the scriptures and its inherent faith in their ability to meet the deepest needs of life had something of real value after all, something which we are in danger of missing in our new emphasis on the pupil and his manifest needs. The Bible claims for itself a unique place in religious matters; what if that claim be well-founded? And why should not the claim be well-founded? The Bible records sweep through fifteen hundred years of history. It is the record of a race which possessed a veritable genius for religion. It contains as its central figure one who is rightly regarded as the one incomparable Teacher of all the centuries. We may well make inquiry as to whether we have been wise in making a wholesale shift from the Bible conception of the pupil and his needs to our own conception of the pupil and his needs. We may well consider whether, compared with the mag-

nificent background of the scriptures, our own background may not be narrow and provincial.

The attempt to make religious education center in the pupil, as our age understands him, has shown a tendency to go wildly astray. First there appeared the Recapitulation Theory. We were told that each individual repeats in his development the developmental stages of the race. Systems of education were quickly constructed on this hypothesis. Children were given reading books which told about their supposed cave-man ancestors, because it was believed that children were in or near the developmental stage corresponding to the cave-man period of human development. Tendencies undesirable in our day, but useful in the far-off past of the race, we were told must be expected to appear, but we were not to be concerned about them. These tendencies should be allowed expression and they would work themselves out, or pass away with the cultural stage to which they belonged; or they would be "sublimated" into something good and desirable. But the theory didn't work. Undesirable tendencies when given the right of way did not work themselves out, they worked themselves into life-long habits and unchanging attitudes. We have found that the Recapitulation Theory is quite unfit to become the central and fundamental principle of an educational system. It gave promise of a short and easy way to set up a pupil-centered program. Let the educational program repeat the cultural stages of the race and the pupil will come out at the highest and most desirable cultural stage that the race

has now attained; so we reasoned and so we planned. We see now that in setting up an educational program centering in the Recapitulation Theory we were not setting up a program centering in the pupil. We should learn from this experience. We should take note of the fact that we can never be sure that any so-called "pupil-centered program" is really such. Our program will be pupil-centered only to the extent that our ideas as to the nature of the pupil are true; and not one whit more.

The attempt to set up a "pupil-centered program" led to teaching of the Montessori type. The interests and instincts of the child were to receive supreme consideration. His freedom was not to be curtailed. He was to develop naturally. The theory had some good points in it, but applied in a wholesale way, it proved to be unsuited for any large use in education and more especially in religious education. When made the governing principle in education, the Montessori theory soon showed that it would develop children, not into little Christians, but into little pagans.

The supporters of the Montessori theory of education made the same blunder as that made by the supporters of the Recapitulation Theory of education. They failed to take note of the fact that their understanding of the child might be defective; that it might be improved by a little modest deference to the opinions as to child nature which had prevailed for hundreds of years, even by a little deference to the Biblical conception of the child and his nature. They made another mistake. They confined their

theory too closely to the child as he is, without taking into consideration the child as he ought to be and the child as he is to be. Bible psychology asserts boldly that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God and there is a profound truth in the assertion, a truth which applies to the spiritual development of children as well as the spiritual development of adults.

The Life-Centered Program. As has been suggested the term "pupil-centered program" is passing out of use. Possibly the educational blunders which have been noted have had something to do with the change in attitude toward this phase. At all events whereas it was a favorite only a few years ago, it is now rapidly disappearing before a new phase, namely "the life-centered program." We hear increasingly that education must center in life. We are told that educational systems have thus far not dealt directly with the life of the pupil.

This latest attempt to formulate a principle which will be central doubtless emphasizes, like those which have preceded it, some valuable element in education and one which has been largely overlooked. We have not taken into consideration as we should the fact that education has to do with a living, developing personality. Experience in Christian living ought certainly to have a large place in religious education. Nevertheless, we ought not to overlook the fact that this new conception of education is subject to the same limitations and liable to the same blunders as the conceptions which have preceded it. As soon as we say that education must

center in the life of the pupil, we are under the necessity of defining what we mean by life. That religious educators have very different conceptions concerning the meaning of this term is evident to any one who is conversant with the religious educational literature of to-day.

There is a wide-spread assumption that in dealing with the thought process of the pupil the teacher is not dealing with the life of the pupil. Educational activities are lauded because they are said to deal with life. The project method is praised because it deals with life. Some of the great religious concepts are dismissed as "empty abstractions" because they are considered to be remote from life. It is quite evident therefore that these so-called "life-centered programs" of religious education are built on certain conceptions as to what the life of the pupil is; conceptions held by those who constructed the programs, but by no means common to all teachers of the Christian religions.

Those who are clamoring for a "life-centered program" of religious education are more and more following biological conceptions of life. They have followed the leadership of men who insist that human life is nothing more than the on-going process wherein an animal organism adjusts itself to its physical and social environment. There is a tendency to eliminate and neglect the distinctly human elements of life and to emphasize those that are animal. Hope, faith, aspiration, the consciousness of God's presence and help; these are fundamental elements in the life of a religious individual;

but they are all but crowded out of consideration by some religious educational leaders through an over-emphasis of such life elements as appear in the amœba and the angle-worm. Life-centered, indeed! If we are to have a life-centered program of religious education it must rest on a conception of human life that is wide enough to include the whole experience of the human individual. Otherwise the use of the term is a delusion and a snare.

The life-centered program is likewise liable to go astray as its predecessors went astray in building its foundations exclusively on the life of the pupil as it is, rather than on the life of the pupil as it should be and as it is capable of becoming. Idealism must be present in the building of the educational program. The program builder must keep in view goals which lie above and beyond the pupil's present experience and beyond the pupil's present capacity to experience. He who has the capacity to analyze deeply the course of events in his own life is able to detect something of the educational element in the providences of God. He finds that he is coming gradually to understand the reasons for events in his career which have long seemed mysterious. He comes to have an unshaken conviction that he is in the hands of a God who has plans for him which lie far beyond his present powers of comprehension. Religious education at its best must have something of this element in it. The religious teacher, in a measure, stands in the place of God, and she must know the life of the pupil not only as it is, but as it is to be.

Elements of the Educative Process which are Important but not Central. We have been considering certain elements which enter into or are related to the educative process. We have seen that the curriculum as an organized body of materials and plans for religious teaching is important, but that it is not central. When attention and effort are centered on the curriculum the educational process is impaired. We have considered the relationships of the pupil to religious teaching and have seen that the nature and needs of the pupil must be taken into consideration; but we have also seen that opinions concerning the nature and needs of the pupil are so varied and our knowledge of the pupil withal so limited that the attempt to make the pupil the center of the educational program has had some unfortunate results. We have considered the claims of the so-called "life-centered program" and have found that it is subject to the same limitations and dangers as "the pupil-centered program." Evidently each of these different educational emphases has produced something of value; but it is equally evident that when this emphasis is carried too far and the attempt is made to center the whole program in any one of the elements emphasized the resulting system begins to go astray.

May we hope then to discover a central and organizing principle for the educational program which will give an opportunity for a proper emphasis of the elements we have been considering and which will not lead to a loss of balance? It is the belief of the writer that such a principle exists and

that it must be formulated and given its rightful place before we can construct a religious educational program that will be as efficient as it ought to be.

The Centrality of Jesus in the Christian Religion. Perhaps the solution of our problem is suggested by the inherent nature of the Christian religion. Christianity is unique among all the religions of the world with regard to the place it assigns to its Founder in its system of doctrine and in the life which it enables its adherents to attain. Jesus is central in the Christian religion. He is central in the sacred writings which have such an important place in the Christian religion. If we make Jesus central in the educational program, the scriptures will be central in the way that they ought to be central.

To make Jesus central in the program is to make the pupil central also. To make Jesus central is to make the pupil's needs central. Every need that religious education is commissioned to supply is found in him who said, "I am the vine and ye are the branches. Apart from me ye can do nothing." There is no character trait that is desirable which he does not possess in perfection. He is the perfect ideal, and if he is so central in the teaching of the Church that children and youth are enabled to see him as he is, the foundations of their religious development are thereby laid. It is well enough to emphasize the fact that the religious teacher ought to know the pupil, but the thing of transcending importance is that the pupil should be taught to know

Jesus. To know him is the first step in the process of becoming like him.

To make Jesus central in the program is to make the program truly life-centered. He is the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by Him. To make Him central in the religious educational program is to make life in its totality central in the program. He was perfect in His physical, intellectual, and spiritual development. His was the ideal life. His life, and not the imperfect life of the pupil, is fitted to establish the governing principles of the educative process.

By making Jesus central in our teaching we make the pupil more truly central than we do when we make the program center in our own imperfect notions as to what the pupil is. We can analyze the nature of the pupil and guess at some of his needs, but the Great Teacher knows his needs.

Scientific and Psychological Sanctions for a Christ-Centered Program. What has just been said may sound to some more like theological declamation than it does like the statement of scientific fact. Nevertheless, there are scientific and psychological sanctions as well as Biblical sanctions for what has been said concerning the possibilities of a Christ-centered program of religious education. In explaining the conduct of individuals, psychologists speak of what they call complexes. They say that a person may suffer from an "inferiority complex." Such a person has, by accident perhaps, picked up certain ideas concerning his own defects of personality. These ideas have been associated into a

system and emotionalized into convictions and attitudes. They form a complex which has large influence over all the person says and does. Psychotherapists cure the individual by discovering the nature of the "inferiority complex" and by dissolving its foundations.

Constructive complexes as well as complexes detrimental to personality may be formed. Indeed, education is concerned with the building of just such complexes. Why may we not conceive of a complex, or sentiment, so central and so all-inclusive that it becomes the dominant control of life? Why may we not think of Jesus as supplying just such a sentiment in the lives of those who believe in him and have accepted him as Master and Lord? There is nothing in any sound system of psychology to discredit the conception of a Christ-centered program of religious education; but on the contrary psychology points unmistakably in that direction.

But this is not all. The Christ sentiment is inherently fitted for just such a place in the life of the individual as has been suggested. The Christ sentiment is a personal sentiment and personal sentiments are more potent than impersonal ones. For the Christian, the Christ sentiment is one with the God sentiment. We all know what a factor the sentiment for the Deity has been in human life. The Christ sentiment blends with man's longing for the Absolute, for perfect purity, perfect goodness, and perfect love. The Christian finds in Christ a light and truth for which his heart longs. Jesus becomes his spiritual guide. The Christian finds in Christ

a calmness and a rest which no other can give, a joy and a strength which are among the abiding realities of life.

What has been said means that the highest intellectual experiences of the Christian center in the Christ sentiment. It means that the deepest emotions of the Christian are centered in Jesus. It means that the Christ sentiment becomes central and controlling in the life and conduct of the Christian. Why then may we not conceive of religious education as having as its main objectives the building of the Christ sentiment in the life of the pupil? Why may we not decide that the religious educational program should be Christ-centered?

The Christ Sentiment in the Life of Paul. Perhaps an illustration will help to make the preceding statements more convincing. Any outstanding Christian personality of history, or any worth-while Christian of to-day, would serve as an example, but we shall consider the Christ sentiment in the life of the Apostle Paul. Thoughts of Jesus and love for Jesus seem to have filled the soul of Paul from that day when he heard a voice from heaven on the Damascus road. He spoke of himself as the bond-servant of Christ. His great ambition was to make Jesus known to the Gentile nations of the world. In Jesus he seemed to hear the high calling of God and in answer to that voice he strove onward toward the goal forgetting the things that were behind. Overwhelmed by persecutions, depressed by responsibilities, and terrified by perils, his source of help was in his Lord who appeared in dreams of the

night bidding him to be of good cheer. Jesus was at the center of Paul's deepest emotions. Jesus was the source of his ambition, the explanation of his extraordinary strivings. Jesus was Paul's teacher and the light which the great apostle has shed upon the problem of life was, according to the testimony of the apostle himself, to be attributed to Jesus alone.

If we would know the secret of such a life as that of Paul we can do no better than take the word of him who lived it. Paul gave Jesus the credit for all that he was and for all that he did. He said that it was possible for Christ to so dwell in the hearts of believers that they would be "filled with all the fullness of God." The Christ sentiment filled the life of Paul and if we wish to produce Paul-like Christians in our day, we will probably have to produce them in the way that Paul was produced.

If Paul were unique in the explanation of his religious life; if he alone of all the New Testament writers traced his religious experiences to Jesus, we might have grounds for suspecting that he was mistaken, but such is not the case. The testimony of Paul is the testimony of every New Testament writer and of every New Testament Christian who has expressed an opinion on the matter. They all call Jesus Saviour and Lord and they all attribute to Him whatever good they may have possessed. If this testimony ended with the Apostolic Age, we might feel that there was some peculiar enthusiasm aroused by the personality of Jesus which led people

to attribute to him more than the facts in the case would warrant; but such testimony does not end with the Apostolic Age. It comes right on down to Augustine and Saint Francis and Martin Luther, and David Livingstone. It comes down to every worth-while Christian of our own times. Not merely the outstanding people of the past and present, but the humbler folk, millions strong, join in this testimony concerning Jesus. Such testimony as this ought not to be disregarded if we are really in earnest in our quest after a central and organizing principle for the religious educational program.

Sentiments Which Merge into Mystical Realities. In what has been said there was no intention to intimate that the Christ sentiment is exactly like any other personal sentiment in its nature and structure. Jesus said, "I am with you always," and the experience of his followers justifies the belief that the statement was not a merely figurative one. In some way, surpassing our powers of comprehension, the Christ sentiment blends into a mystical reality and we know our Lord not merely through the words he spoke in the long ago, not merely as a character of history, but as a living and objective presence. We have communion with him. This communion with our Lord is the goal of Christian education. We shall attain it best when we place him at the center of the educative process. We shall move on toward it as we follow him who said, "I am the light of the world, he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life."

Date Due

3 DAY RESERVE

SEP 23 '61
SEP 26 '61
OCT 11 '62
OCT 15 '62
OCT 17 '62
SEP 26 1983
OCT 1 1983
DEC 6 1983

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

232.954
S774

Squires, Walter Albion
AUTHOR

The pedagogy of Jesus in the twi-
TITLE light of to-day.

232.954
S774 Squires, Walter Albion
The pedagogy of Jesus
in the twilight of to-day.

15004